THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

In the third number of the series called 'New Foundations,' Mr. Middleton Murry, under the title, *The Dilemma of Christianity* (James Clarke; 3d.), has brought his recent thinking on the world problem to a kind of focus. The dilemma will appear in due course. But first of all Mr. Murry blocks in a historical background for his analysis. This background is the average British Christian's conviction that we are fighting on God's side, partly because our fight is for freedom, and partly because it is against an abhorrent system of tyranny and brutality.

The Christian Church seems to be implicated in this moral complacency. We are as a nation facing, in a condition of deep moral confusion, a future that is utterly unknown. And there does not seem to be much relief to be found in institutional religion. What Mr. Murry looks for, and demands, is a recognition of our implication with the enemy in a common guilt. This is not widely recognized. It is true there is a minority movement in the Church which does recognize it. It is represented most comprehensively by the *Christian News-Letter* and, of the small group most intimately associated with this, perhaps one in five is a Pacifist.

But Pacifist and non-pacifist within this group are united in the conviction that this war is a civil war caused by the contradiction between man's technological civilization and his spiritual barbarism. It is not primarily a struggle between good and evil, personified by Britain and Germany respectively. It is rather the fearful nemesis of a universal inertia, a universal refusal to face the sacrifice of taking the better way. This is the real line of division between British Christians. And in Mr. Murry's view it is only where the common guilt is deeply acknowledged, even to the point of agony, that Christianity is alive in Britain to-day.

Here is where the dilemma begins to appear. Among those who do make the acknowledgment of our common implication in guilt a vital issue arises: How can the guilt be repented of? How can we bring forth the works of repentance? What, here and now, does repentance *mean*? Two different kinds of answers are attempted. There are, on the one hand, those who believe that the work of repentance should be the effort to create, in the very agony and act of war, a society of social justice here in Britain. How to do this is not clear, because it almost looks as if war itself were needed to bring this about.

It is the war that has brought employment to the unemployed, and taken much of the sting out of the means-test—measures of simple justice long overdue. But when the war is over, can such measures be maintained without such a social revolution as men's minds and hearts are completely unprepared for? The emotional unity of war, though prodigiously powerful during war, collapses at the coming of peace. No one who remembers the years following 1914–18 has any doubt of that. The idea of carrying over the unity of war into the period of peace, and taking advantage of it to solve the problems of peace, is attractive indeed; but it must be pronounced specious and unrealistic.

For the economy of war is entirely alien to the economy of peace in an industrialized mass-society. The break in continuity will be catastrophic. The choice will be between keeping the nation employed by preparation for more war, and keeping it employed in production for peace. But the latter choice is quite revolutionary in its implications; while the former is a nightmare. Yet any middle way may mean anarchy.

The second suggestion for bringing forth the work of repentance is this. It is the answer of those who believe that the economic and social techniques of an industrial mass-civilization are, in themselves, inimical to the development of the responsible Christian person, upon whom—both parties are agreed—the enduring regeneration of society must depend. The psychology of those who are habitually engaged in routine labour and routine pleasure becomes that of a spiritual nonentity, utterly incapable of the kind of moral and social regenerating conviction and activity needed. The disease is too radical, being ingrained in the very substance of an advanced machine civilization.

Therefore the cure must be radical, and those who adopt the second way hold that the path to social salvation is somehow to establish centres of autonomous and religious living—nuclei of a new community—by whose influence (as by the monasteries in the Dark Ages) society may gradually be recivilized on a Christian basis. This is evidently a specific which has a large place in Mr. MURRY'S thoughts. He advances it also in the Pacifist symposium *Into the Way of Peace*, reviewed in 'Literature.' He probably has in his mind such communities as the Cotswold 'Brotherhood.' Indeed, the thing is being attempted already by some Pacifists who have been obliged, under the terms of their exemption, to labour on the land, and have gathered themselves into small communities for the purpose.

It is evident that one condition of the creation of such Christian cell groups for the regeneration of society is the adoption of a new sense of values, a new simplicity, a new attitude to life in which richness of living has little to do with money and simplicity does not imply poverty of living. Fundamental to any such sense of values is a religious attitude to the staple texture of human living. Religion must pervade the whole of life, and the community which is created by such a common conviction and practice will be united by this hierarchy of moral and domestic values, and will meet together simply for the settlement of their common concerns and for the worship of the God to whom the pattern of their daily lives is a humble yet worthy offering.

This is Mr. MURRY'S way of hope. But over all hangs the sense that we are plunging into the unknown, and that our paramount need is an utterly new kind of faith and fellowship. This is to be found in what he calls the 'minority movement.' Among the 'members' there is growing, tentatively and shyly, a new sense of brotherhood in Christ which easily overleaps all denominational boundaries. Will the Church become one of these simple brotherhoods? If there is a dilemma with only two ways, and the economic way is blocked, will the Church take the other?

Humanism is a hard-pressed word. This is quite understandable; for it is a word at once useful and attractive. But the result is a great deal of confusion and misunderstanding in its use. This could only be removed by a study of the word in its various contexts. Such a study is so far provided in Dean Lynn Harold HOUGH'S recent volume (reviewed in another column) on *The Christian Criticism of Life*. It is a volume in which with learning and discrimination the tale of historic humanism is unfolded.

Humanism was a fact before the word itself was coined. When thinkers in Athens in the fifth century B.C. turned from the study of things to the study of the human mind with its thoughts and ideals, it may be said that humanism was then born. For humanism rests upon the distinction between a life engrossed with things and a life concerned with thought; or more precisely,

between the sense of a natural world to be controlled and that of a spiritual world to do the controlling. Without the sense of a controlling human intelligence mental life would have no meaning, the moral life would go down, æsthetics would be emptied of significance, religion in any lofty view of it would be impossible.

'This sense of man as the possessor of kingly intelligence emerges in Greek feeling long before it is given sharp and formal expression. It is implied in much of the writing of Homer. It peers around all sorts of corners in the tale of the wrath of Achilles, and it is woven all through the fabric of the tale of Odysseus. Indeed, it runs like quicksilver through all of Greek literature, both before and after the great days of philosophical achievement.'

In Rome, as in Greece, humanism was a fact without yet having a name. Latin humanism receives characteristic expression in Cicero, who had entered into the heritage of Greek thought, when he says that in the fitness of things reason should command and appetite should obey. If Greece represents the civilized mind thinking, Rome represents it acting, as making noble use of its freedom and power.

It is true that in the Middle Ages men were preoccupied with God rather than man, but even so the period can hardly be described as non-humanistic. It is a mind given to the world by Greece which appropriated the revelation which came from Israel. One thinks not only of St. Augustine at the threshold of the Middle Ages, but also of St. Anselm, St. Thomas Aquinas, Abelard, Peter of Lombardy, not to name also Dante, whose guide and interpreter was the great Latin humanist, Vergil—till the passage is made beyond Hell and Purgatory.

Many gifts from classical humanism went to the enriching of the great movement which was the first to win the name of humanism. Then it was that man acquired a new consciousness of himself and his powers. He came to realize that life is lived on two planes—the human and the natural—which intersect but do not coincide. Said a humanist of the Renaissance: 'Thou shalt have power to decline into the lower or brute creation; thou shalt have power to be reborn into the higher or divine, according to the sentence of thy intellect.'

If the humanism of the Renaissance may be described in general terms as cultural, or as the humanism of self-culture, other humanisms of a more specific character have arisen since, and have claimed the name for themselves. Not that the stream of classical humanism ceased to flow. It served indeed, and still serves, to unite the Protestant churches and the Latin communion.

Science while dealing with the sub-human is none the less humanistic, whether it knows it or not. Whitehead, Jeans, and Eddington know it. Scientific formulas can only be constructed by free intelligence. The scientist can only be accounted for by humanism. That is why 'critical humanism,' while understanding the pessimism of Samuel Butler, insists not on abandoning the machine but on taking moral control of those who make and use the machine. And the 'critical humanist' carries the principle of free personality also into the sphere of social reform and into the still higher sphere of divine relations.

When the debate is maintained in this last-named sphere various types of humanism emerge. Being an American theologian Dr. HOUGH does not forget to remind us of that 'nontheistic humanism' which was put forward by Channing and Parker and other leaders of the Unitarian movement. He tells us that when the word humanist is used in religious circles in the United States it is usually with reference to this little group of thinkers who had ceased to believe in a personal God, yet desired to preserve the humanistic values. They were obviously quite outside the central stream of historic humanism. Freedom, intelligence, control, are great words that sweep beyond the human.

Then there is 'theistic humanism,' which ascribes the unity and variety of the universe to the free control of divine intelligence. In that free and

controlling intelligence is found the goal of human thought and the source of power for human life. 'Only in a free God,' it is said, 'is the life for free man secure.'

But the philosophic humanist should pass, according to our author, into the 'Christian humanist.' It was only when the Son of God made human life His own that the possible life for men was made clear. The Incarnation is the crowning fact in the history of humanity. Yet while man can know God (this is one aspect of the paradox), man can never know God (this is the aspect Karl Barth has stressed).

Here comes another type of humanism. At the point where man is at the limits of his strength there meet him the mighty reinforcements of the grace of God. Through his 'Christian humanism' he reaches the truth of the Word made flesh; but only through its culmination in 'evangelical humanism' is the full message of the divine grace received and man saved from frustration and despair. Upon the Cross the supreme arbiter is seen as the supreme sufferer.

Other types of humanism may occur to the reader, such as the pragmatic humanism of Professor Schiller, and the scientific humanism of Julian Huxley, but enough has been said to give some indication of the historic meaning of the word, humanism, and its place in the cultural thought of the world.

A 'Penguin Special' has been issued dealing with *The Gospel for To-morrow*. The writer is Dr. J. W. Hunkin, the Bishop of Truro, who gained distinction in the last war as Chaplain with the Twenty-ninth Division in Gallipoli and France, and who since then has found time amid his episcopal duties to write several books of note.

His present subject is an intriguing one, for to-morrow will inevitably be a new day in the history of the world. After the earthquake has passed, leaving universal devastation, there must necessarily be a period of reconstruction, and men must find stable foundations on which to build, and sound material to build with, if the new order is to endure and not be burnt up as 'wood, hay, and stubble' in some future conflagration.

Where shall such material be found? Dr. Hunkin is in no doubt as to the answer. 'I believe that *the Gospel for To-morrow* is the Gospel of *Reasonableness*. Blank scepticism is barren; unreasoning credulity, sometimes called faith, is silly. . . . What we need is *Religion revealed in its true nature*, its fundamentals presented in their right proportions without artificial embellishment and without distortion. If the men and women of the present generation will honestly bend their minds to this task I think they will find themselves brought to a very striking measure of agreement, and the result will be not a new Religion, but a new edition of the Christian Religion itself.'

It is absurd to think of inventing some new religion, and quite unnecessary. For man has been religious from beyond the dawn of history, and a forest of religions already exist. There is no need to wander through that forest and perhaps get bewildered. 'The particular tree nearest to us may need pruning, certainly does need pruning and other attention, but it is by no means dead.' It is still capable of bringing forth good fruit for the salvation of the world in the new age which is upon us as in ages past.

'What is the essential message of the authentic Christian Gospel? Can it be translated into the language of to-day?' In the Bishop's view it is to be found in this, that 'through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father.' 'Those words to me imply, or rather declare, that our Spirit, by which we approach God, is identical with the Spirit of Jesus, and the Spirit of God: that there is only *one* Holy Spirit, and that we all share it. That is the eternal link between God and man—that our Creator has made us sharers of His Spirit, which He showed in full in Jesus, and that by that Spirit we are called to be in our measure creators, saviours, inspirers.'

Before commenting on this let us continue the Bishop's exposition. He would recall us to a fresh and reverent study of 'the Word from the Past,' a word which centres in Jesus Christ, of whom we have an authentic picture in the Gospels, the picture of One who 'struck His contemporaries as a *Tremendous Revelation*,' who inspired His followers to new spiritual life and moral activity, and whose influence is still dominant in the world. The Church, also, which is the bearer of that Word from the past, is to be studied with understanding and sympathy. Great as her faults and failures may have been, her achievements have been greater. And there is much that can never be tabulated or known, for, as has been truly said, 'Her spectacles and her geniuses are marvellous, but her unknown saints are her power.' This rich heritage we must examine and appreciate, not to go back upon it or blindly imitate, but in order that, catching its inspiration, we may ourselves think and construct for the future.

Such a survey should lead to a clearer understanding of, and warmer agreement on, the fundamentals of our Religion, and particularly fundamentals of Belief, Conduct, and Worship. 'Christian beliefs and practices can be roughly divided into three headings, corresponding to the L. S. D. columns of money sums. In the first column (the L column) will be set things of fundamental importance. They are comparatively few in number. In the second (the S column) things of interest, with a certain value of their own, but not essentials. In the third column (the D column) minor things, not to be despised, but to be kept in a quite subordinate position. I believe the vast body of Christian people will find themselves in close agreement with regard to the first column. Considerable differences will be found with regard to the second, and more still with regard to the third. . . . We must thankfully recognize our essential agreement as to the first column, we must patiently seek to adjust differences as to the second; and as to the third, we may well agree to differ for the present.'

This is happily expressed, and in working it out Bishop HUNKIN has much to say that is wise and reasonable on the subjects of belief, conduct, and worship. There are many articles in the Creeds, and they are strewn with the watchwords of bygone controversies, but the ultimate truth they seek to express is belief in the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. 'In face of all the Evil of which we are so terribly conscious, must we, can we, believe in God? Yes, the objection of Evil, heavy as it is, is not fatal. . . . For our human ignorance many questions must, of course, remain. But Good is more fundamental than Evil. Evil is a variation upon Good. It appears as an ill-understood distortion of Good. It is the Good that is primal and eternal; and primal and eternal Good must in the end mean God.'

As for rules of conduct, 'the beginning of wisdom,' as Epictetus said, 'is the finding of a standard.' And the Christian Religion offers the standard of the Golden Rule, requiring for its fulfilment a love which is prepared to go to the utmost limit of self-sacrifice. 'Life thus lived, life thus freed from the *self-centredness* is life of a *super-natural quality*—using the word in its most serviceable sense. St. John's Gospel refers to it as "*eternal* life." And that indeed is what it is. It is the true life of the spirit, and the death of the body cannot interrupt it.' This life is nourished through acts and habits of worship which have their own place and value. It is also lived in a community which must be organized and governed in the most seemly and efficient way.

Now, while all this is persuasive and reasonable, one wonders whether it is adequate as 'the Gospel for To-morrow'? The thing stressed is man's spiritual kinship with God, rather than man's alienation from God. Should not the side of Bible teaching—that side which speaks of man by nature as being 'dead in trespasses and sins' and only able to be raised from the dead by a mighty recreative act of God, have more emphasis?

Reconstruction Problems.

II. Vocation in Work.

By the Reverend V. A. Demant, D.Litt., B.Sc., Richmond, Surrey.

The fourth of the Church Leaders' Five Points for a recovery of social health states that every man should be able to consider his work as a divine vocation. In this article I am attempting to explore what this criterion means and what conditions are involved in it.

What is a Vocation?

In the rough we may say that a vocation is a work to which a man is called by God. But the fourth point of the prelates is both narrower and wider than this general conception. It is concerned presumably with that form of work in which men are employed for their own livelihood and in providing things and services for which the community pays them. Voluntary service and creative activity outside employment are not part of the problem with which the Five Points are concerned. Secondly, the criterion is clearly meant to be a test of conditions which affect not only the Christian workers, but all men, including many who have no religious convictions which would lead them to put the question in terms of a divine call to their work.

In fact it is well to be clear that it is only in a derivative or analogical sense that we can use the specifically Christian idea of 'vocation' as a test of value and meaningfulness in the work by which men get their living. The Bible uses the idea of the calling in both a strict and a secondary sense, but even the latter is a much more theological conception than the one this fourth point lays down as a standard.

In its strict theological meaning the 'calling,' according to St. Paul, is to membership of the Kingdom of God, and is part of the doctrine of justification (1 Th 2^{12}), such a 'call' induces a certain indifference to one's status in the kingdom of the world (1 Co 7^{20-24}). For the most part, however, the New Testament, like the Old, uses the term for a summons to the individual man or people or Church to a particular duty which carries its own privilege and responsibility. But whether used in its purely soteriological sense, or in that of a life-task, vocation is held to proceed from God's eternal purpose. It has the note of divine authority and is independent of, and often opposed to, man's sense of fitness or inclination for the task to which he is called. It is no doubt because vocation has its origin in the unfathomable decree of God that the Church has never been able to lay down an unmistakable criterion of a vocation and that there is little guidance for finding one in the teaching of moral theology. Though the Church has rightly been shy of defining a vocation by any human tests, there has been a general Christian understanding of certain states of life as 'vocations,' such as life in a religious order or the priesthood, and this idea has then been more widely applied, for example, to celibacy, or marriage, or some occupation demanding special renunciations, such as the mission field, nursing and dangerous public services. It should be noted that these 'vocations' represent not a call from idleness or evil-doing to work and well-doing, but a call from a normal good state of life to a special task that involves a restriction of valid satisfactions.

It is therefore a far cry from the idea of vocation as used in the Bible and in Christendom to the requirement that daily work should be considered as a divine vocation. I am not condemning this modern Christian usage; in fact I uphold it. But I consider that nothing but harm and confusion and fantasy can follow a neglect to appreciate that we are now stretching the idea of vocation to include something which Christian thought has not yet succeeded in handling under this heading.

The Historic Background of the Contemporary Problem of Work.

The problem is not made easier, but more difficult, by the fact that the most serious attempt to develop a doctrine of 'the calling' for man's daily work, was made under the auspices of Calvinist Protestantism.[1] While this attempt must be saluted for its valiant intention, it has actually put us in a worse muddle, because Calvinism provided the strongest religious impulse, among others, for the growth of industrialist-commercialism; and

[1] For the Idea of the Calling in Calvinism, *see* E. Troeltsch, *Social Teaching of the Christian Churches*, ii., and Max Weber, *The Protestant Ethic and the Spirit of Capitalism*.

it is this civilization which has produced a world where masses of men can find no significance in their work, even a human significance, let alone a sense of vocation. A diagnosis of the process leading to this result would take us too far afield. But Troeltsch's conclusion, that the contribution of Calvinist habits of thought to the problems of the commercial era is only an indirect and consequently an involuntary one, leaves the important point obscured. The point is that reliance upon a purely subjective principle, namely, the calling to man to be active in a process, without attention to the function of the process, leaves man with the impulse to intensify his activity as a pledged sign of grace without regard to the objective value of the result. Naturally, when the intense religious faith that marked the rise of the doctrine faded, men retained the psychic dispositions associated with it and unconsciously held on to a belief in salvation by activity.

However that may be, it is certain that we have little reliable guidance in the historic tradition of the Church for deciding what vocation in work means. The tradition is not therefore worthless. It is only in recent times that the question of significance in work has become acute. For the greater part of human and of Christian history men had a hard struggle with Nature; it could be said of the human race up till lately what G. K. Chesterton said of the housewife: 'I will pity Mrs. Jones for the hugeness of her task; I will never pity her for its pettiness.' Now it is rather the soul-numbing meaninglessness of much work activity that is in question. A new problem has arisen and it calls for Christians to bring out of their heritage 'things new and old' for a moral and sociological equipment to deal with it, in the same way as the Church's doctrines were drawn out of its basic experience to cope with heresies as they arose.

The tragic fact is that no Church tradition in the last two centuries has been effective in preventing the domination of life by economic motives. Christians have been content to morally sweeten the results. After the break up of the unstable mediæval synthesis, in which economic life was kept in its more natural place, more and more of the mass of men lost any real emotional satisfaction in their employed work. This was fully realized by that queer genius Rudolf Steiner in the days of the last war.[1] Many of the more intelligent workers tried to find the satisfaction in a scientific or Marxist account of their distress, which they could not find in the activity of work itself. Programmes were consciously embraced as policies for the cure of the evil, but on a deeper level they were espoused for the feeling of mastery in the intellectual and political sphere which they gave men, as a compensation for loss of the sense of mastery and significance in daily occupations. This fact, that men sought in theory and political movements what they missed in their work-life, accounts for the doctrinaire character of Marxism and other philosophies of workers' movements that claim to be total accounts of human life. When the inherent weaknesses of economic salvation doctrines were detected many turned to historic realities like nation, or state, to biological realities like *Volk* or Race, or to naked violence and military might. Readers of P. Drucker will know how much the spiritual malaise of the work problem, and not only or most deeply the unemployment aspect of it, played in the rise of Nazism.[2]

[1] See his *The Threefold Commonwealth.*

The Fourth Point's Requirement.

After this brief review of the background of the problem, we can ask what is the intention behind the prelates' fourth point? It uses the idea of vocation in a wide sense as meaning a conviction of significance or value in work. There seem to be two tests for such a requirement. Either the work springs from the creative urge in man as a skill-hungry creature or it is given significance by the certainty that the worker is doing something socially beneficial. A task may be soul satisfying even when personally irksome if it is known to be 'doing good,' that is, making a contribution to the good life of the community. It is disastrous to romanticize and talk as if only creative work can be a vocation. These two valid motives in work correspond, in an analogical sense, to the two kinds of prophetic call in the religious sphere, as recounted in the Bible. Dr. Peck has pointed out that Jeremiah was called to the prophetic office by a kind of divine predestination which overrides his sense of unfitness. 'Before thou camest out of the womb I sanctified thee and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations.' Isaiah, on the other hand, found his call in response to a particular spiritual need of his community: 'Whom shall I send and who will go for us?' 'Then said I, Here am I, send me.'[3] The fourth point obviously envisages a society in which a man's occupation falls under one or both of these types of call. We may say, therefore, that this principle is a demand

[2] *The End of Economic Man.*

[3] W. G. Peck, *Return to Holiness*, ch. v, The Christian as Prophet.

that a man's work should be something he could present as an offering to God if he were a believer.

Some Conditions of Fulfilling the Demand.

A full discussion of these is impossible here. I give a summary of what seems to me the main conditions, and then deal with what I believe to be the chief obstacle in the way.

The proletarian lack of status of the masses must be superseded by a condition in which the worker has an inalienable status in the community. Proletarianism means a state in which the man is not paid as a man, *i.e.* twenty-four hours per twenty-four, as it were, but as the source of so much labour, paid so much per hour and for so many hours, just as gas and electricity are paid for. Work in this case means only selling labour power. To effect the recovery of status for the worker a general and a particular change are necessary. The general one is that the distributive mechanism of money shall reflect real demand and productive possibilities. That is to say, the population's income will have to be proportionate to the results of economic activity, and not proportionate to the contribution necessary for the result, either in the form of energy expended or abstention (savings). The use of natural power from the earth, replacing human muscular energy, has radically destroyed the possibility of measuring the value of economic results by the amount of human energy expended. How far a restored status demands higher paid work or some income independent of work, or both, is a problem of social policy and not an economic one. But without this adaptation to the energy facts of the power age, men will continue to multiply opportunities for economic activity for the sake of income, whether the result meets a real economic need or not. In so far as it does not, it is useless to talk of vocation in work.

The particular change referred to is that full achievement of a sense of vocation in work will come only with the disappearance of the division between two classes of producer, worker and owner, and the organization of all engaged in valid economic tasks in corporations or guilds to meet the real demand for their services. This requirement has a large literature and some historical experiments to its credit, which demand much more attention and further development.

While no one is so foolish as to say that all routine jobs are soul destroying and cannot be considered vocations if they are really useful, nevertheless many routine tasks in attendance on machines leave the operatives no energy after working-hours for creative or re-creative pursuits or for normal healthy human intercourse. And where a balance between work and a real life besides work is upset, the idea of work as an offering becomes impossible. The natural man cannot *offer* what he is not free to withhold.

I would say further that the possibility of men feeling called to their jobs becomes more real as the community takes on a pattern which reflects the natural order in its economic pursuits. For our industrial-commercialist culture this involves recovery of a pattern in which use and nurture of the land takes basic place, factory production becomes a secondary asset; commerce and trade a convenience of third importance; and financial activities the most instrumental of all, serving, but in no sense deciding, economic purposes. That is the order corresponding to the nature of man as created.

Mr. T. M. Heron has rightly called attention to what he calls 'the autonomy of the technical.'[1] By this he means that there is a right way of doing a job; it has its own technical law. And while this is not a moral or spiritual law, true religion has an obligation to stand by the man who really gives himself to a job which is the best he knows. Mr. Heron also points out that this right of the craftsman or technician is denied by practices which assume the autonomy of economic and financial considerations. Now, there are alarming features of our economic practice which steadily deprive men of mastery in technique. This responsible mastery is strongest where men have links with certain parts of the material creation like the land, mining products, raw materials, and good machines. It most easily disappears where men manipulate and exchange instead of making and handling material. Where agriculture comes under the control of financial houses, who have only a business interest in the land, the vocation of technique is endangered if not destroyed, because the interests and mental dispositions of nurturing the land and of buying and selling are on entirely different levels. Some of our largest steel firms which were for many years directed by real steel magnates with an interest in steel, are now merely the adjuncts of London commercial and financial concerns, and in their offices steel experts are more and more displaced by mere business seekers. On a different plane, a butcher of my acquaintance has been recently hurt in his soul because his firm has made him display and sell tinned vegetables as well

[1] 'Vocation, Life and Work,' in *The Guardian*, April 10, 1941.

as meat. 'You know, sir,' he said, 'I'm a butcher, not a tradesman.' In other words, there is a vocation to a particular trade which involves a technique in handling material as well as trading ability; but there can hardly be a sense of vocation for men to be traders *in general*. The drift towards a situation in which more and more men get their living by commissions on exchanging and moving things about, and still worse by trading in the money symbols of trade, is an unhealthy development which will have to be reversed if a universal sense of responsible and meaningful work is to be achieved.

The Chief Obstacle.

For the majority of men vocation in work will mean a sense that they are called to their tasks by a positive human purpose. That is to say, a man's task must be a socially useful one, useful not in the narrowly practical sense, but as denoting that others want the use of his services. Now, whatever social and economic policies will be required, there is one truth so fundamental that its application precedes all questions of policy and programme. It is that the validity of a work depends upon the real human demand for it, and not upon the fact that it provides its performer with an income. The platitudinous nature of this truism has been concealed from us for two reasons. One is that our culture has partly succeeded in keeping up its volume of employment by a growing number of ridiculous and redundant activities, activities that are of no positive or social use; the world would be no worse and a lot better without them; they are practised because their agents have to insert themselves into the stream of money income somewhere, and the community has to be persuaded, cajoled, frightened, or induced by social snobbery into paying for them. This is called overcoming sales resistance. And the most alarming feature of this dishealth is the impossibility of getting any form of economic activity condemned, if it can be shown to employ a population. Suppose that a sufficient public opinion could influence government to stop nickel and iron ore and petrol being exported to a likely aggressor nation, or investments for its industries, the country concerned would have to face the fact that this would lower its opportunities for employment. If this were to become a boon instead of a disaster, the internal economy of the producing countries would have to be altered. Suppose further that we gave our technicians real scope for their God-given gifts and expected them to make good, durable clothes, buildings, and machines, instead of things that wear out quickly and have to be replaced, we should have to find a way of giving the population economic security with a smaller amount of activity. In brief, if the character of work is to be considered primarily as a means to provide work and income tied to work, then bad and wasteful work is the way to do it.

The second reason for our failure to face this elemental problem on its proper scale is that every modern community has been concerned with an 'unemployment problem' which has taken precedence of all others. And so long as our politics and economics do not review the whole question in terms of physical and human realities, so long as they simply try by different kinds of administration to mitigate the tragic human sufferings of unemployment by 'making more work,' just like that, so long will talk of vocation in work be unreal. A highly industrialized Europe has now got what it asked for, namely 'more work,' by rapid destruction in war. And if what we have been used to consider as 'full employment' is the only condition of economic security, it should be considered whether war and slave states on the German model are not the only way to do it. Communist and Nazi economics represent only a later state of the problem of capitalist industrialism, and are in no fundamental sense a reversal of its unconscious aims. The war has come as a sort of demonic cure for the false problem we have all set ourselves—full employment. And the post-war situation will, as soon as the wastage begins to be made good, press us to re-discover the meaning of economic purpose.

The vocation of the worker can only be found in terms of performing a task as efficiently and qualitatively as well as is humanly possible. Society must make its arrangements so that this purpose is not expected to fulfil the contrary purpose of making work.

It would be a good exercise for forming the right frame of mind if we ceased to be surprised that we have an unemployment problem, and brooded on the extraordinary fact that men have to work so much harder in peace time with all our productive skill than men had to in the fourteenth century, allowing for the fact of the increase in population and our higher standard of living.

Half a century ago Nietzsche described a community in which vocation in work was a real possibility: 'The artisans of the South are not industrious because of acquisitiveness, but because of the constant needs of others. The smith is industrious because some one is always coming who

wants a horse shod or a carriage mended. . . . In a fruitful land he has little trouble in supporting himself; for that purpose he requires only a small amount of work, certainly no industry.' I give this quotation not as providing a model for our future, for that would be a foolish rejection of the real benefits of applied science, but as illustrating two indispensible conditions for a society in which men could work with a sense of vocation. The first condition is that, whatever their place in the economic process, men must not be too far removed from the biological basis of their existence in the land, for they cannot exert any social or economic pressure for the maintenance or improvement of their status, if that is going to upset a vast and complicated net of transactions by which they get food for their bodies. The second condition is that vocation in work requires a set of social relations in which a job looks for the man and not a man for the job.

Literature.

THEOLOGY, POLITICS, AND 'CHRISTENDOM.'

WHAT have religion and politics to do with one another? Can the Church afford to remain aloof from political issues, or must it revise its traditional attitude, recognizing that what concerns the secular authority must be the concern also of Christian opinion and Christian leadership? These questions are familiar and important, but less fundamental in the end than the problem with which Principal Micklem deals in *The Theology of Politics* (Milford; 7s. 6d. net)—the ultimate dependence of our political convictions upon our theological beliefs. If the Communist finds the need for some kind of 'pseudo-theology or substitute religion,' and the Nazis 'against their will and beyond their comprehension have become involved in very complicated matters of theology,' can it be said that a better theology has led us, or might lead us, to a better social order than either Communism or Totalitarianism can yield? Do we not 'need the impulse of religious conviction at least as passionately held as the pseudo-religions of Germany and Russia?' In other words, are we justified in concluding that our politicians will be largely helpless to achieve the new world-order of which men speak and dream without the force of a religion based upon a true theology?

The significance of such questions need not be stressed. To their treatment in this series of essays Dr. Micklem brings a full knowledge of the principles of Communism and of National Socialism and Fascism, as well as a penetrating and sometimes disquieting insight into the outlook and attitude of the democracies to-day. Keeping steadily in view problems of the war and of the post-war world, he writes of them, and of the competing political systems of to-day, with a wide background of thought from Plato and Aristotle, Hobbes and Rousseau to their modern successors. Throughout, there is emphasis on the fact that true or false conceptions of human nature, which are essentially theological, are the conditions of political success or failure. There is an idea of humanity which appeals to reason and conscience and is recognized by the 'common sense' of mankind—'those maxims, convictions, and intuitions about life and its meaning which have come down to us from the immemorial experience of the race.' Allied to Christian thought, but not specifically based upon it, this view of human nature can point us to 'Christendom,' in the sense in which a statesman like Mr. Churchill can use the word. 'Christendom' is 'the goal to which we are marching and will march'—'no mere dream but practical politics if its cause be served by those who add to a sound philosophy a passionate faith.'

The treatment of these and kindred topics is fresh and stimulating. Dr. Micklem has many wise and helpful things to say for our guidance. His deliberate choice of a strictly rational presentation of man's true nature, which limits him 'to the field of "natural theology,"' may enhance the value of the book to the non-Christian reader. It will elicit, however, from many within the Church, questions as to how far 'Christendom' thus defined is Christian in any full sense of the word, and whether a confessedly Christian anthropology might not be of greater service to the world of to-day than ideas which owe 'as much to Hellenism as to any distinctively Christian source,' and which can be described as 'human or humane . . . sober common sense.' Such criticism, however, would

ask from the book what it does not pretend to give, and might be met by the answer that the author is clearly aware of his self-imposed restrictions. He almost breaks away from them more than once, as in his assertion that 'we must return with new seriousness to the Gospels if we would solve our economic problem.' The value and defects of the method, indeed, are clearly shown in the conclusion, which not only sums up the preceding argument, but points us forward to the Christian gospel. 'Natural theology is common sense, but its ideas only catch fire as they are assumed into the revelation of the holy will of the living God. . . . To be effective, our longing for a new and better world must be quickened and empowered by the passion of a personal loyalty to Christ and a devotion to the will of God.' This is indeed the basis for a better world-order, but is it not to be reached by a very different path from that of reason and common sense?

J. G. RIDDELL.

THE CHRISTIAN CRITICISM OF LIFE.

Dr. Lynn Harold Hough, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary, has written a very informative and attractive book on popular lines, entitled *The Christian Criticism of Life* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.50). He possesses a wide range of learning and employs, usually, a crisp and pointed style (tending at times to the rhetorical), while the lucid expositions combined with the untechnical phrasing will commend the work to the general reader. The references to contemporary writings are for the most part to works by American authors; and many will be glad to learn more about the contributions to thought which have been made by such considerable authors as Irving Babbitt and Paul Elmer More.

The objective of the work is a synthesis of humanistic philosophy and Christian theism. We welcome its appearance at a time when it is modish in theological circles to say that humanism has utterly failed, that it must be abandoned root and branch, and that our only hope lies in the new suprahumanism which in the last decades has been inviting our attention. It has been a demand more than an invitation and appeal, and a very insistent demand to boot; and there are many who observe in the new conservative movement, in certain forms of it at any rate, an undue depreciation of human values.

Dean Hough makes a hopeful point when he says that we may gather from the neo-Thomist movement, as represented by Jacques Maritain and Etienne Gilson, that there is a common front over large areas which Protestants who still represent the central stream of the classical Christian thought share with their contemporaries of the Latin communion. He even seeks to describe this common front: 'In respect of the personality and ethical perfection of God, in respect of the personality of man and his pivotal position at the place of dangerous but necessary choice, in respect of the deadliness of sin, in respect of the entrance not only of the glory of God but of the God of glory into humanity in Jesus Christ, in respect of the far-flung significance of that deed on the Cross whose moral potency carries with it the power of redemption, in respect of the new life the Christian leads by the Grace of God, in respect of the incredible richness of the divine life as a social organism of unselfish love, in respect of the suffusion of all life with the glory of the Christian sanctions, in respect of the immortal life with its clarification of all moral issues and the eternal penetration of the life of man by the glory of God—in all these things there is a high tradition which the neo-Thomist and the neo-classic Protestant hold in common.' And he adds, 'It is at point after point a characteristic aspect of this tradition that it is rich with the fertilization of a noble humanism.'

The volume is in large part a portrayal of the story of humanism from the ancient days of Greece and Rome through the Middle Ages, the Renaissance, and the 'Protestant Revolt' right down to modern times. Some impression of its contents may be gathered from a reference in the early pages of this number. We are told that the saving of this golden word, humanism, from non-theistic interpretation and the exposition of 'evangelical humanism' have been the great moving impulses of Dean Hough's thought. Certainly he leaves us in no doubt in this work as to his critical humanistic standpoint, and his Christian criticism of life has the merit in particular of being expounded in view of the present international situation. It is his conviction that the business of the Christian is not only to keep the soul of the world alive but to fight for civilization in the face of invading barbarities. For civilization is Christian, and when it ceases to be Christian it ceases to be civilization.

W. FULTON.

CHRISTIAN REUNION.

Christian Reunion: A Plea for Action, by the Rev. Hugh Martin (S.C.M.; 6s. net), is a broad-minded and fair-minded treatment of a subject which is of

urgent importance in view of the appalling wastage of Christian effort at a time when the state of the world calls for unity both amongst the older churches at home and amongst the younger churches overseas. It is urged that the business of Christianity requires haste, and at the same time calls for wise, determined, and persistent effort. The author is optimistic, and can speak confidently of the 'united Church which will one day come to pass.' Even if the achievement take a long time, that is all the more reason for beginning action now. For our encouragement in this attitude we are asked to note that the title of the book is not Christian Unity but Christian Reunion; the former is already achieved in Christ Himself, and the latter means the bringing together of a family which is already a unity by virtue of a common faith and allegiance.

The book makes no claim to be original, and is confessedly based on certain agreements which have already been registered by representative conferences, notably the *Outlines of a Reunion Scheme for the Church of England and the Evangelical Free Churches of England*. And, lest such an outline should seem to be theoretical merely, careful historical retrospect is given of the movements towards unity which have taken place in the last few decades as well as of the actual unions which have been accomplished. The basis of further union can lie only in a common faith, and Mr. Martin argues that this presents little difficulty if only we will recognize that the historic creeds are not rigid formulæ valid for all succeeding centuries, and that, for example, we may hold the Nicene faith while not endorsing the Nicene thought-forms. The question of the Sacraments is a more difficult one. The discussion on Baptism includes a masterly treatment of the causes which separate Baptists from other communions, and the suggested solution is that we should emphasize the 'total action' which is implied in the continuity between Baptism and Confirmation. As regards inter-communion Mr. Martin is wholly in favour of the attitude which regards this as a means, and not merely as an ultimate end. He cannot agree with those who think that inter-communion is wrong until organic unity has been attained. He pleads for at least reciprocal inter-communion of individuals, which would be both 'a foretaste of unity and a great incentive to seek its completion.' In the matter of Church-order he rather evades the difficulty, which is felt by many, of uniting on an ambiguous interpretation of Apostolic Succession. He points out that such ambiguity is to be found *within* the Church of England as well as outside of it, and this rather *tu quoque* argument hardly meets the case. An ambiguity which is already in existence is, we hold, not anything like so great a burden on the conscience as one which is explicitly accepted as the basis of an immediately contemplated and detailed union. We are given a trenchant criticism of the present illogical connexion of the Church of England with the State, and Mr. Martin advocates an adjustment broadly similar to that which has been arrived at in the Church of Scotland, where Parliament has not *conferred* spiritual freedom, but simply recognized rights inherent in the very nature of the Church. Mr. Martin's final point is an application of Chesterton's dictum that 'to make a thing real, you must make it local,' and he advocates decentralization and regional autonomy, urging that in defined areas there are great opportunities, especially at the present time, for the churches to improve relationships, to grow together spiritually, to think together, and to work together in evangelism and social witness.

W. S. URQUHART.

The Origin and Meaning of the Lord's Teaching in Prayer, by the Rev. J. O. F. Murray, D.D. (Abbey House, Westminster), is the title of a booklet which gives a devotional exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The writer feels that the new order which we hope will emerge after the war must be based on a more conscious dependence on God, and for the cultivation of such dependence the practice of prayer is essential. Hence this little commentary which is at once thoughtful and devout.

Canon W. J. Brown of Wakefield Cathedral, who has taken an active interest in religious education in England, has issued *The Church and Religious Education: A Policy for Discussion* (6d. net). In the first section the writer gives some arresting statistics which throw light upon the future of Church schools. In the second section, on religious education, he puts forward a number of definite proposals for discussion. These seem very sane and practical, and if adopted would go a long way to remove the religious difficulties in the English education system.

A series of booklets under the general name of 'New Foundations' (James Clarke; 3d. net each), begins with *The Idea of God*, by Mr. J. D. Beresford, and continues with *The Way of Exchange*, by Mr. Charles Williams. The third number is Mr. J.

Middleton Murry's *The Dilemma of Christianity*, referred to elsewhere. There is literally no coherence between the views of the three writers. Mr. Williams is apparently a fully Catholic Christian believer; Mr. Beresford is a traditional rationalist; and Mr. Murry is a Christian with a dark eye on the Church. Mr. Williams's book is an intelligent exposition of 'bear ye one another's burdens.' It hardly merits the description of a new foundation; but it is an earnest, capable, and edifying treatment of an essentially Christian theme. It is difficult to understand how the editor of the series could regard Mr. Beresford's essay as a foundation for any kind of structure. 'The idea of God' is certainly fundamental, but its treatment in this pamphlet is not helpful.

The Pacifist position is stated afresh from different angles in *Into the Way of Peace*, edited by the Rev. Percy Hartill, Archdeacon of Stoke-on-Trent (James Clarke; 6s. net). The volume contains essays written entirely by communicants of the English Church. There are eleven of them, and it may be said of the book as a whole that the case is presented with clearness and force. The conclusion is reached all the more easily that the writers do not acknowledge that their position compels them to equate absolute Pacifism with the refusal to use any kind of force. 'The problem is,' writes the editor, 'not whether to use force but what quality of force may legitimately be used, by whom, and against whom, it should be used, and what quantity is appropriate to the special circumstances.' After all that the way is easy! Mr. Middleton Murry is among these prophets, but his Pacifism is of a very broad and general kind. 'The very existence of any kind of "free society" now depends upon the total abolition of war. Since, obviously, the independent existence of the Christian Church depends upon the existence of a free society, it follows that the Christian Church should be committed to the abolition of war on the condition of its own independent existence.' That is Mr. Murry's position, set forth with his usual lucidity and vigour. We need not discuss the question here. It is sufficient to say that any one who wishes to know what Pacifism is and why it is maintained will find all he wants in this book. Surely, however, it was a mistake to include the note on pp. 59–61 which gives the whole Pacifist case away.

No one is more perfectly at home in all that pertains to the Wesleys than is Dr. J. Ernest Rattenbury. To his previous writings on that theme he has now added a valuable study of *The Evangelical Doctrines of Charles Wesley's Hymns* (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net). In it he shows that Charles Wesley's hymns express the true theology of Methodism. They are popular, appealing to the heart as well as to the head, yet by their sanity of statement they were a powerful safeguard against mere emotionalism and nebulous mysticism. In the course of this exposition Dr. Rattenbury succeeds in giving a wonderfully clear picture of the two Wesleys, united in evangelical fervour but markedly different in character—John the logical thinker and practical organiser, Charles the passionate lover of God, hyper-sensitive and anxiously introspective, now soaring on wings of joyful song, now plunged in depths of gloom. Their differences on points of doctrine, especially touching perfection, are dealt with in an illuminating way. As the range of Charles Wesley's hymns is very wide, covering indeed the whole field of Christian doctrine and experience, his exposition of them amounts in effect to a popular systematic theology of an unusual type. Probably the book will be most valued by many readers for its copious quotations on every page of the finest verses of the hymns. These give a glow to the whole book which will make it a joy and a lasting treasure to many devout hearts.

This new venture in editions of modern versions of the Bible—*A Shorter Version of the Moffatt Translation of the Bible* (Hodder & Stoughton; 2s. 6d. net)—should serve a useful purpose, especially for those who value Moffatt's translation as a whole but find the larger volume inaccessible. Of course many will complain that favourite passages have been omitted, but the selection proceeds upon the principle of emphasizing the working of God in human life. The headings of the various sections are themselves illuminating and indicate the general character of the compilation. Genesis and the historical books come under the titles of 'The Beginning of History,' and 'The Forging of a Nation,' and the New Testament headings are also fitting and comprehensive. In the Introduction the hope is expressed that the book will be found useful for the men in the services, who, it is said, have been kept in mind during its preparation. A pathetic interest attaching to the publication is that both the editors originally concerned with it, Mr. Murray Barclay Buxton and Mr. Alfred Barclay Buxton, were killed in an air-raid before the work could be completed.

The Indian Christian Book Club has issued a book of considerable historical and religious interest—*Asramas Past and Present*, by P. Chenchiah, B.A., M.L., V. Chakkarai, B.A., B.L., and A. N. Sudarisanam, B.A. (2 rupees). It is dedicated to the memory of C. F. Andrews and is commended in a Foreword by the late Rabindranath Tagore. The book gives an interesting history of the various types of asramas, or religious retreats, in which Indians from ancient times have sought to practise the higher life. After falling for a long period into desuetude this form of religious community-life was revived early last century by such men as Ram Mohan Roy, the friend of Duff, and has been developed in our time by Mahatma Gandhi and Rabindranath Tagore. The practice has been taken up by the Indian Church and promises to become an influential feature in Indian Christian life. The book is written by Indians for Indians, and the Western reader will have to pass through a barrage of unfamiliar Indian names and religious technical terms, but the adventure will bring its own reward. One danger of the movement is obvious, namely, that it may lead to a vague theosophy in which Christian and Hindu elements are mingled. 'In the asrama both the Christian and the Hindu leave behind the entanglements of tradition, doctrine, ritual, and sacrament, and seek to live and worship in spirit and in truth . . . Hinduism and Christianity have developed two separate tendencies which need to be unified for the fulness of life.' It is understandable that Indian Christians should be proud of their national heritage and anxious to acclimatize their faith, but from the first the uniqueness of Christ has been a fundamental tenet of the Christian religion, and the Early Church decisively rejected the Gnostic attempt to equate with the gospel the religious heritage of Greece.

The recently published autobiography of Cyrus Adler—*I Have Considered the Days* (Jewish Publication Society of America; $2.50)—gives a picture of an interesting and versatile personality. Adler touched life at many points. He was a fine Semitic scholar, an inspiring teacher, and an able administrator. But he was no recluse and played his part in national and international affairs, especially as a worthy representative of Jewish interests in many lands. He travelled widely, and was at home, not only in England but also in most of the Mediterranean countries. Yet his account of his own life suggests a quiet and modest character, forced to the front by sheer efficiency, and his friends have earned the gratitude of many readers by publishing his story.

Those who remember with gratitude the regular issue of Bishop Winnington Ingram's little green shilling books, containing the addresses given at his yearly missions, will welcome any collection of a similar kind such as we have given us in *The Secrets of Fortitude* (Longmans; 2s. 6d. net). These expositions bear the stamp of a hand that has not lost its cunning. They are simple, direct, spiritual, and always to the point. They make admirable devotional reading, and they would afford both inspiration and suggestion to clergy and laity alike.

It is indeed a bold thing to write another book on the Lord's Prayer, but here is one that has a distinctive character and is worth its place on the book shelf. Its title is *Everybody's Prayer*, by the Rev. W. H. Murray Walton, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 3s. 6d. net). It was written originally for Japanese Christians and many of the illustrations used are drawn from the writer's experiences in the Far East. But while this gives it a certain flavour of its own it does not make the book in any way sectional. Here is sound scholarship, careful and interesting exposition, with wise and practical application. No better text-book on the subject of prayer could be put into the hands of all who in these troubled times are being moved afresh to seek after God.

Conditions such as the present are particularly conducive to the growth and development of eschatology, and this general law may be illustrated by the appearance of *The Great Prophecies of the Centuries*, by Mr. G. H. Pember, M.A. (Oliphants; 3s. 6d. net). 'Reappearance' would, perhaps, be a better term, for the present volume consists of selections taken from three of Mr. Pember's works originally published in 1901 and 1909. The editorial work has been skilfully done, and the new volume reads like a continuous production. It has all the familiar marks of eschatological writing—stress on the iniquities of the world and of a large section of the Church, concentration on numbers of isolated passages, arbitrary interpretation which is sometimes rather forced, and, in general, the assumption that prophecy was not so much a statement of the eternal laws of God as the prediction of individual incidents. Hence we note the practical neglect of by far the greater part of the prophetic writings which have come down to us—Amos, Hosea, Jeremiah, and others are hardly mentioned except for the occasional verses which may be given an apocalyptic turn. At the same time there

is no doubt about the sincerity of the author, and he has the merit of basing his interpretations on the original text and not on any translation. He belongs to a species of student, now almost extinct, which would not accept knowledge of books about the Bible as a valid substitute for familiarity with the *ipsissima verba* of Scripture.

We have received from Messrs. Pickering & Inglis a few of their Golden Grain calendars and diaries for 1942. The *Daily Meditation* calendar (2s. 5d.) maintains its high artistic merits, and the same may be said of the *Golden Text* (1s. 10d.), *Daily Manna* (1s. 6d.), *Grace and Truth* (1s. 6d.), and *Young Folks* (1s. 10d.). All these have a tear-off block and a text for each day of the year.

The *Golden Grain Diary* is well arranged and has all the qualities a diary ought to have. There are two sizes—the standard size and a vest-pocket size—and a variety of bindings. The prices of both editions range from 1s. 6d. to 9s. 9d. All prices include the purchase tax.

A commentary on *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, by Mr. F. C. Synge (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), will supply all that any student wishes and what many who are students only in the broad sense have long sought. The author begins at the beginning and goes through the letter, verse by verse, explaining the terms, and Paul's meaning. It is called a 'theological commentary.' Perhaps it would be better called an exposition. At any rate, by any name it is first rate. There is no introduction. The writer plunges right into the middle of things. But he adds two valuable, scholarly appendices, on the doctrine of the ecclesia and on the authorship. He seems to think that Paul can't be the writer of both Ephesians and Colossians, and he chooses Ephesians. These two matters are relegated to appendices by the author as if he said: These are subsidiary matters. Read the letter first, and then you can deal with such secondary questions. The sound scholarship of the book should be emphasized. It is a book to read and to keep and read again.

Some time ago the Rev. F. Barrie Flint published 'Twenty-four Talks to Children on the Sunday Gospels' under the title of 'After Trinity.' He has now completed the cycle of the Christian Year by 'Talks to Children on the Festival and Sunday Gospels from Advent to Easter.' These two series are now published together under the title of *Talks on the Sunday Gospels* (S.P.C.K.; 5s.). The talks are bright and interesting, usually beginning with some incident or illustration likely to catch the attention of children. A good deal of the teaching is probably beyond the reach of juniors, but for older boys and girls it is admirable.

A series of addresses delivered to a Congregational Church at Richmond have been published under the title, *Britain and the Future*, by the Rev. Daniel T. Jenkins (S.C.M.; 2s. net). They deal with such subjects as: Why is Hitler God's Judgment on Us? The Church's Weakness in the Modern World; Errors of the Right and of the Left; The Foundation of Democracy—Personal Responsibility; The Form of a True Democratic Society; and The Choice Before Us. The addresses are earnest and thoughtful, and, if the speaker was occasionally led by his zeal to make some perhaps over-emphatic statements, the excess may be pardoned for the intention behind the statement. These addresses are good examples of the service the pulpit may render in a time like the present when definite guidance is so seriously needed.

A series of broadcast talks about *The World We're Fighting For* is published by the Student Christian Movement (2s. 6d. net). The broadcasters are the Rt. Rev. Monsignor R. A. Knox, the Rev. G. L. Russell, M.B., Ch.B., the Rev. Anthony Otter, and the Rev. W. J. Noble. It would be helpful, in a book like this, to know what the speakers are. We all know R. A. Knox, because we have read his detective novels about the 'Indescribable.' Perhaps we should know the others also. At any rate their subjects are interesting and they are handled in a simple, direct style. The subjects are: The World We're Fighting For; The World as We see It; The World and its Works; and the World and the Way of Christ. Those who heard the talks will be glad to have them in this permanent form. And those who missed them will be able to repair the omission.

Biblical Criticism and Christian Culture.

By Stanley Cook, Litt.D., F.B.A., Emeritus Professor of Hebrew, Cambridge.

To-day we place the Bible in the frame of universal history and religion. Not only does it become part of a vast field, widening our horizons and altering our perspectives, but it is possible that the progressive development of Biblical study may lead to a progressive development of culture on the largest scale. By the word 'culture' I mean the intellectual, moral, and spiritual aspects of civilized life; and just as the Renaissance, the Reformation, and a new conviction of the real and immediate value of the Bible marked a definite epoch in human history a few centuries ago, so there is reason to think that the course of Biblical research may prove to be no less influential in these days of change.

It is the aim of Biblical criticism to work in harmony with the principles employed in other fields. Consider, for example, textual, literary and historical criticism, comparative religion and the comparative study of literary and religious 'patterns'—in these and in other disciplines the Bible is treated as any other source, and in accordance with tested principles. There are, however, three obvious differences. The one is the admittedly unique history of the growth of the Bible and of the transmission of its contents. The second is the necessity—sooner or later—of ensuring that our treatment shall take into account its influence in Christendom. And the third is the demand—again sooner or later—for a reasoned relationship between our intellectual interests and our highest personal values. To-day no one mind can pretend to be in touch with the manifold disciplines that bear upon the Bible, and no two minds have precisely the same intellectual interests and personal needs. We possess a really enormous amount of material relating to man, his history and his beliefs; but we have no underlying cultural foundation, no common unifying background or 'universe of discourse.'

The Bible enables us to take a very comprehensive view of the past. We look at the lands of the Bible, at Palestine and its neighbours. We know something of their geological history, the dawn of man, and even 'the darkness before the dawn'; we see something of the faltering steps in the history of civilization. After long ages we reach the beginnings of continuous history, the vicissitudes in and behind the Bible, the parting of the ways (Christianity and Judaism), the disappearance of the old Oriental culture, the rise of Islam, and, finally, medieval and modern Palestine on the one hand, and Christendom on the other. What an impressive story a competent pen could tell of it all! Intellectually we pass from one branch of study to another (*e.g.* geology, anthropology, history, and psychology), and we feel that there must be some natural continuity between them. We cannot rigidly separate the interconnected disciplines; nor can we draw hard and fast lines between the Biblical account of God in the world of Nature and of man and our own accounts of 'natural' processes.

We gain invaluable material for our notions of development and evolution, the rise and fall of States, their stagnation and revival. We find various sorts of borrowing and of reciprocal influence; it is really noteworthy what a fine field the lands of the Bible present for our studies of cultural problems, and how slight is the use made of them by our experts. The Old Testament takes us back to primitive and barbaric types of religion; but as we advance through the Hellenistic period and the New Testament we raise questions of theology and philosophy that are still incompletely answered. When we take a long view, do we find gaps and discontinuities or do we find an intelligible development? The true interrelation between the more primitive and early types of thought and those that are more intelligible to the Westerner is still imperfectly understood, yet it is upon the nature of mental or ideological development that our hopes for a better future depend. Much is said to-day of a coming new age or order; but not only does the Bible, when viewed historically, illuminate some great changes in the past that have helped to make us what we are, but we see something of the processes that are to be kept in mind when we discuss how social, political, and religious changes have been and can be made.

Archæology and the monuments have made the Bible live; they have shown us—if that were necessary—a people whose religion was realistic to an extent we often fail to understand. The Bible does not conceal all the failings of its great figures (*e.g.* Jacob, David, Peter); and the blacker

we paint Israel—and we are often reminded of her defects—the more outstanding are her permanent achievements for humanity. And this is surely a significant fact for our struggling and imperfect race. That the best men of Israel were men like us (cf. Ja 5^{17}) encourages us, even as the manhood of Jesus unites Him to mankind (cf. He $2^{17f.}$ 4^{15}), so that He is neither utterly transcendent, nor is He the pale image that Docetism endeavoured to depict. We lose much if we exaggerate the unique merits of Israel or reduce her to the level of other peoples.

Men and peoples can have the defects of their qualities or *vice versa*. Robertson Smith long ago (in 1877) remarked that 'the very tone of mind which makes Semitic heathenism the most hideous of false worships, enabled the Hebrew nation to grasp with unparalleled tenacity and force the spiritual idea of Jehovah.'[1] In that ancient world we measure the heights and depths of human nature. The impure cults and human sacrifices betokened intense elemental and passionate ideas of surrender and gift, of loyalty and unity. The prophets saw both the strength and the weakness of the religion of their day; and the fact that it was ethicized by them meant that Yahweh *did* require something of men (cf. Mic 6^{8}), and that the intimate connexion between Yahweh, his people and the world, was a real one. Fundamental urges, feelings and ideas can be expressed and made concrete in ways that are harmful and even degrading. Indeed we know of beliefs and practices to-day—not in the East alone—which recall those condemned by the prophets. We may deplore and ignore them; but we should do well to seek to understand the psychical factors that account for them and should consider whether they can be sublimated and ethicized. In general, a candid, discerning, and critical understanding of the ranges of human nature and also of the less pleasing depths of the human psyche would put us in a stronger position in our relations with all that *we* consider inferior and contrary to Christianity. At the same time, any religion—such as our own—that claims to possess the truest conception of Divine Reality invites the warning of an Amos (3^{2}), namely, that it will be judged by a higher standard.

When one turns to non-Biblical fields of research one gets the impression that the sciences proper (physics, etc.) tend to bridge the gulf between man and Nature, whereas the social sciences—if they are to be called sciences—tend to sever the two. On the one hand, we are called upon to realize man's incredible insignificance in an overwhelmingly vast universe, although, to be sure, the very consciousness of this gives grandeur to man, even as in religion the consciousness of the 'otherness' of one's God and of His transcendence is an experience that uniquely enhances man's position in the universe. On the other hand, not only is man's uniqueness heavily underlined, he is now responsible for the long-range control of his destiny; he now shoulders the ultimate responsibilities which he had formerly 'pushed' on to God. Social evolution is no longer at the mercy of 'blind' forces, society is self-conditioning. This, I think, is the characteristic note of modern humanism; and if one is irresistibly reminded of the story of the Tower of Babel rather than of Ps 127^{1} ('except the Lord build the house . . .'), the 'few words' or small vocabulary of the ancient builders suggests a basic *Ur-sprache* that quaintly foreheralds our own 'basic English.'[2] It is unnecessary to spend more time over the two trends, it is enough to say that the one is for the more exact scientific knowledge of man and his universe, the other for the immediate task of speeding up social evolution: the one more theoretical and academic, the other more practical.

In the Bible, as in all early religion in general, there is not the severance of Nature and man familiar to us; between man and the outside world and the unseen there is an intimate relationship. In the Old Testament Yahweh, Israel's own God, whose firstborn she is, is God of all creation and controls the events in Nature and man. And in the New Testament there is a similar triangular interconnexion: Christ and the 'Body of Christ,' Christ redeemer of men, and immanent in the universe. The 'Nature Psalms' acknowledge the divine wisdom which makes the universe a cosmos instead of a chaos; and Professor Adam Welch has pertinently observed that the prophets in their polemic against Baalism, in their keen sense of the personality of God, and in their insistence on ethical religion, 'ran the risk of introducing a dualism between man and nature. They were driven into exaggeration in order to deliver their people from a mere nature-religion,' one however that 'held a truth which also needed to be recog-

[1] *Lectures and Essays*, 425.

[2] This translation of Gn 11^{1} is justified by Gn 27^{44} (see *e.g.* Skinner). One wonders how the old myth-makers got the notion; was it perchance suggested by the simplicity of the alphabet of 22 characters in contradistinction to the innumerable signs in Akkadian; or was it the armies of mercenaries from different localities each with its own language, with perhaps a few words in common?

nized, the truth that man is part of nature and that all nature reveals God.'[1] Both Religion and Science, we may say, unite Nature and man, whereas humanist and sociological research is, of course, focussed solely upon man. God operates in pre-human as well as in human history, but humanism would control the forces in man which rule in Nature.

A. B. Davidson's chapter on 'Typology in Nature and Revelation'[2] handles a theme that is no longer pursued. It seems hopelessly old-fashioned, until one looks beneath the phraseology. It is then possible to see that he is dealing with analogies or homologies in Nature and the recurrence of significant parallels in Biblical history and thought. Instead of 'types' and 'ideas' (in his sense), we think of patterns, configurations, schemata and the *gestalt*-psychology. The typologist notes the similarity of pattern in fin, wing, fore-limb and arm, and turns from the increasingly complex and richer patterns in Nature to the similar sorts of activity in the Bible (*e.g.* Messianism, sacrifice, covenant-relations). The essence of the 'type' is not an identity, but a real functional or essential similarity and a development from earlier to later, or lower to higher, institutions, acts, and persons. Of course the tendency to find types and figures was pushed to extremes—not to speak of other faulty methods; but the comparative method in general always runs this risk. It is suggestive but can be misleading, and we have to take each case on its merits, as when we—superficially—compare the wings of a bird and those of a butterfly.

All I am concerned with here is the real interrelation between Nature and man. Creation, as A. M. Fairbairn said, is a continuous process, and he made the very important suggestion—one of wide philosophical import—that 'what is energy in nature is reason and will in man.'[3] As Davidson points out, the Hebrew thinker 'came down from his thought of God upon the world; he did not rise from the world up to his thought of God.'[4] That is to say, one can start from a 'religious' standpoint and gain a vastly wider conception of the universe; though, of course, it may be open to criticism. Or one can attempt to construct a synthesis, starting from the world around, in which case one finds a gulf between what we call the 'natural' and the 'supernatural'; and the relevance or existence of the latter will then probably be denied. Yet, as Fairbairn further remarked, Nature is not rationally conceived when we exclude the supernatural; and Robertson Smith commented upon the way we are dominated by our antitheses.[5]

The interconnexion between God, man, and the universe is very emphatically expressed at certain great epochs in Biblical history. We can trace this at the Amarna or Mosaic age from Egypt to Mesopotamia.[6] Amos, preaching social righteousness, recognizes a unique relationship between Israel and Yahweh who is over the whole universe: the prophets are not social reformers alone, their foundation is theistic, and their God is a cosmic power. In the Second Isaiah, Yahweh has no equal and Israel is the espoused people of the God of the universe. Finally, at the rise of Christianity God is not only the supreme and transcendent power of the universe, He is also the Father of His children; and Christ is more than Redeemer and Friend of man, He is the Logos, the principle of order and reason. Accordingly, no far-reaching theory of our 'mysterious universe' can ignore the intuitions, convictions, and recurring experiences of the character of the relationship between man and the universe through the God of both; and the more seriously we propose to discuss the possibility of a new age or order, the more decisively must we see that our religious, our humanist (or sociological), and our scientific interests and values are in harmony or at least point in the same direction.

At the rise of Christianity there was an intelligent and quasi-scientific interest in the outside world (*e.g.* Wis 7^{15-20}); but the efforts to synthesize (*e.g.* in Gnosticism and Manichæism) were of a sort pre-doomed to failure. Had they succeeded they would have throttled both religious thought and scientific curiosity; whereas, whatever may be said against Christianity and the Church, the fact remains that keen intellectual inquiry has never been killed. Christianity, properly understood, entails a perfect confidence in God and in

[1] The *Psalter* (1926), 15.

[2] *Old Testament Prophecy* (1903), ch. xiii.

[3] The *Philosophy of the Christian Religion* (1902), 59, 171, etc. The point is not that the 'energy' of physics appears as reason and will, but that the x (a logical term) appears in these very different but fundamentally related forms. The fin does not reappear as a wing but the x appears in both, and also in other forms.

[4] *Theology of the Old Testament*, 32.

[5] Fairbairn, *op. cit.*, 56; Smith, *Prophets of Israel*, 311 ff.

[6] See my *The 'Truth' of the Bible*, 104 ff. The ethical Yahweh of Elijah is also a God that controls Nature, even though He manifests Himself in the quiet voice (1 K 19^{12}).

His universe ; and while we are now learning more of the incalculability of things, the God whose keynote is 'I will be what I will be' (Ex 3^{14}) is one whose operations will be found by men to be justified. That is to say, Israel's recognition that there is a fundamental right-ness, even though she had to suffer exile and misery, unites the highest conception of an untrammelled but by no means arbitrary divine righteousness and justice with our discovery that we cannot take Nature for granted. The misplaced assurance and self-confidence of certain phases of the humanism of to-day are disconcerting and ominous.

But we cannot take the tendencies of this age as a norm. New religious stages are apt to be followed by a decline (cf. Dt 32) ; and the years when Yahweh could do neither good nor evil (Zeph 1^{12}) were followed by the vivid, ethical monotheism of the Second Isaiah. The rise of Christianity came after the scepticism of Koheleth ; and Philo's suggestive use of the concept of the Logos died out, superseded by the new and pregnant meaning with which the Christians charged the conception. At such times of renewal we can discern a blend of old and of new elements : Israel owed much to pre-Israelite belief and custom, and post-exilic Yahwism of course comprised much that was pre-exilic. To be sure, throughout we seek to determine exactly what is old and what is new, and also what is a new form of the old, and in this way we can learn much that is exceedingly instructive and suggestive. We may note, for example, that while the pre-exilic prophets denounced the high places, the local cults and the regional *baalim*, later we find local synagogues, angelic and other beings (as functionaries, patrons, etc.) ; and the modern survival of local saint or *weli*-cults testifies to the inveterate nature of certain fundamental types of belief and custom. Theoretical and academic though all this may appear, it cannot be denied that much of the present-day discussion by non-experts, or by sociological and other experts, would be of more value if only greater attention were paid to what can be gained from a critical study of the vicissitudes in and behind the Bible.

There is much more that might be said, *e.g.* on Biblical and other conceptions of corporate personality and the like, or on our ideas of continuous processes of creation. The Bible tells of the consciousness of mission and destiny, but also of the conditions. It combines individualist and social or communal points of view, national and international aims, exclusive and universal ideals. It gives us a thoroughly dynamic view of the ebb and flow of history and thought, and is therefore of topical significance to-day. When the Bible was regarded whole-heartedly as a Sacred Book it had a more than 'devotional' or 'Sunday' value ; it had a direct meaning for national and individual life. Increasing attention is being paid to-day to the teaching of Scripture ; but there is no liaison between simple Bible instruction and the various departments of Biblical and other research. Nor is this to be wondered at, seeing that in scientific, philosophical, and other fields of thought there is at present no little uncertainty and absence of harmony.

In conclusion, though I do not wish to be guilty of exaggeration, I believe that the Bible may have a greater part to play than hitherto, not only in religion, but in our culture. I have attempted to suggest as briefly as possible how Biblical study is bound up with inquiries and questions that are of real cultural importance ; and it is surely no unreasonable belief that that line of development which looks back upon Israel, Greece and Rome will be progressively continued in the future among the people or land that finds the Bible an inexhaustible source of inspiration in the widest sense of that term.

The Accuser.

By the Very Reverend R. O. P. Taylor, M.A., Vicar of Ringwood, Hants.

It is always difficult to realize, in view of what took place later, that Satan only makes three appearances in the Old Testament, and that even one of these is editorial and doubtful. The real vogue of the term and its equivalent Diabolos (familiar to us in its English guise of Devil) came later. It is in full force in the New Testament, where Satan occurs some 32 times and Diabolos some 36, generally in the sense of a focus of all evil. The adoption of this meaning is believed to be due, largely, to the influence of the Persian conception of a leader of the forces of darkness. This

had already affected the use of Diabolos at the time of writing the Book of Wisdom, in which we find 2^{24}, 'Nevertheless, through envy of the devil came death into the world, *φθόνῳ δὲ διάβολου θάνατος εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον*.' Not only had Diabolos become a personal name, but its original meaning of Accuser had become totally submerged. In this effacement the main consideration raised in the Old Testament was lost. Though this change has long since received general adoption, it is unfortunate, because a valuable piece of moral teaching is thus let slip.

It is worth our while, then, to go back to the usage in the Old Testament. The cardinal passage is the Prologue to the Book of Job. In this a definite turn is given to the word Satan, a common noun meaning Adversary, which turn is emphasized in the Septuagint, where Diabolos is used for it. This, as we have just remarked, means an accuser. In the Prologue we have the Satan as an official in the court of the Divine King. He is the Public Prosecutor, attending a divan along with the other royal ministers. Called to give his report, he replies merely that he has been on circuit, apparently having nothing to bring forward. The King asks whether he has gone into the case of Job. The Prosecutor answers that he knows about him, but has nothing adverse to report. At the same time, he suspects—and here the flaw shows—that Job is only loyal because he is making money out of it. The Satan is then authorized to put the question to the test. At the next audience he is asked for his report. He admits that his former suspicions have not been justified. But, in spite of this, he puts forward other suspicions, and is again given authority to test Job's loyalty. Having acted on this, he disappears from the stage. But enough has been told to justify the hint given in the very way in which the question of Job was first raised, that a passion for accusation has mastered him and deformed his character. He has become a mass of suspicion.

Though Satan is not mentioned again, his temper is an element running through the book. Indeed, it had emerged before any mention of Satan had been made. For Job himself shows a marked liability to give way to it. Whenever there has been a gathering of his family, he suspects that they may have 'sinned and renounced (marg. blasphemed) God in their hearts' (1^5). Indeed, his suspicion is so strong that he immediately takes active steps to atone for their possible disloyalty to God. He 'sent and sanctified them and offered burnt offerings according to the number of them all.' As the suspicion would not have been there if the idea had not already a place in his own mind, it looks as though there had been some grounds for the Accuser's charges. And Job's own wife, who presumably knew him well, considered him capable of disloyalty to God (2^9). As a matter of fact, he never lapses into it, though, all the same, he comes sufficiently near to it to show that the temptation had a hold on him. His very first speech, cursing the day he was born, is not only a typical piece of misanthropy,[1] but also an implicit indictment of his Maker. To take another instance, his complaint (9^{32} ff.) that he is not allowed to argue the matter out with God, scarcely shows the loyalty which is the fundamental question in the Prologue. And when, at the end, God answers Job, He addresses Job as one who has set himself up against Him.

The attitude of Job's three friends has been obscured for us by the popular phrase, 'Job's comforters.' It is true that this is derived from the Hebrew text, as we now have it. But how the words 'comfort' and 'comforters' come to be in that text is an unfathomed mystery. There is not a line in the book to suggest that they ever attempted to offer any comfort. The Septuagint translator, and presumably the text which lay before him, took a very different view of their purpose. They are said to come, not to comfort, but to hold a visitation, *ἐπεσκέψασθαι αὐτόν* (2^{11}). In line with this, instead of the 'miserable comforters' of 16^2, the Septuagint has 'advocates of evil,' *παρακλήτορες κακῶν*. After the crescendo culminating in Eliphaz's denunciation of Job, followed by his sketch of the career of the wicked—evidently meant to Job's address—the criticism is just. They had begun in a judicial capacity, but have become prosecuting counsel, and, in accordance with the usual practice, make up for the want of a case by abusing the defendant. And the intrusive Elihu merely goes one better by condemning them all. He is the culmination of that arrogant and critical frame of mind which is exposed by the book as a whole, and is crushed by the very first words which God speaks.

The picture with which the Book of Job opens was not new, but already had its own existence in men's minds. This is shown by its being assumed in the first half of Zechariah, which appears to be

[1] Compare Dean Swift, who read this chapter every year on his birthday and was the author of that ferocious attack on human nature, *Gulliver's Travels*. But there was another side to his character, as there was to Job's.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

some fifty years older. In Zech 3^1 we find, not perhaps a divan, but a court over which the Lord presides. The Satan is present, in readiness to indict Joshua, the high priest. He has good ground for his indictment; Joshua is covered with iniquity. The end of the scene is different, as the Prosecutor is rebuked, and Joshua is rectified by other means. But the conception is the same. The Accuser has his rightful place, but may himself go wrong.

The other allusions, or reminiscences, in the same part of Zechariah, help to show that the parable had already an articulated existence of its own. In Zech 6^7 the 'strong,' who are the executors of God's justice, 'went forth and sought to go that they might walk to and fro through the earth: and he said, Get you hence, walk to and fro through the earth.' This language at once suggests the description of the Satan's circuits, and also suggests something of the dangerous zeal which lowered the Prosecutor into a Persecutor. The language used of God's own scrutiny of man (4^{10}), 'They are the eyes of the Lord which run to and fro throughout the earth,' is again obviously related to the same phrase, and carries us farther back, to the origin, in God, of the activity entrusted to the Satan.

In spite of all the accretions the idea of the Accuser persisted. It can be traced through the jungle of Jewish demonology. Charles, writing on Rev 12^{10}, gives various examples, one typical being, 'Michael and Satan are like the advocate and the accuser who stand before the court.' And there is, of course, the well-known fragment embedded in Jude 9, the contention between Michael and the Diabolos, where the language, διακρινόμενος διελέγετο, is that of a legal dispute.

When we come to the New Testament a clear echo of the scene in Job is heard in Christ's words (Lk 22^{31}), 'Simon, Simon, behold Satan asked to have you[1] that he may sift you as wheat'—which petition was evidently granted. The reference to Job, and to what the Prologue to Job stands for is not only plain, but needs to be considered if the transaction is to be understood. And it is distinctly implied that Satan will be acting within his allotted and legitimate sphere, though, as in Zechariah, other influences will supervene.

Again, the reference is evident in 1 Co 5^5, 'to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' The sentence is, in its way, a summary of the Book of Job. This is seen to be unmistakable, when it is remembered that the poem of Job concludes with God's appearing in order to declare His judgment, which is precisely the meaning of the Day of the Lord.

Later still comes a similar reference in 1 Ti 1^{20}, 'Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I delivered unto Satan, that they might be taught not to blaspheme.' What action is meant, in these two cases, we do not know. But, plainly, it was on the model of Christ, and was based on the knowledge that there is still some one, or something, called Satan, which serves a moral purpose and has its place in the service of God.

Nor did the specialized idea maintain its existence only in connexion with the Hebrew term Satan. In spite of the constant religious use of Diabolos as a summary of all evil the everyday meaning of the word, accuser, was bound to assert itself. Yet there seems to have been some difficulty. Thus, in 1 P 5^8, we find 'your adversary the devil,' adversary, ἀντίδικος, being a special kind of adversary, *i.e.* an adversary in a law-court. It looks as though the writer felt the necessity of emphasizing the natural force of Accuser, expressed in the word Devil. (The word which follows, 'goeth about,' περιπατεῖ is, by the way, almost the same as the word used in Job which is translated 'going up and down.')

Indeed, the submergence of the literal sense of Diabolos seems to have irked the writer of the Apocalypse, in spite of himself. In 12^9 the Great Dragon, the Old Serpent, Satan *and* the Devil are all rolled into one. But in the very next verse the author goes right back to the Accuser of Job, and, as was done in 1 Peter, re-translates, using ὁ κατήγωρ, 'the accuser of the brethren.'

The continued recognition of the special meaning of Diabolos, even in a Christian context, and apart from the thought of a leading personality, is shown in another way. In 1 Ti 3^{11} and Tit 2^3 women are warned against being Diaboloi, and in 2 Ti 3^3 men are denounced for being such.[2] In dealing with these passages it has been the custom of English versions, not to use the word Devil, but to use a translation, Slanderer. This is, of course, better than such a mangled Greek word as Devil. But, in the light of what has been here shown, it does not exhaust the significance of the warning. The trouble does not begin in the adoption of so palpably bad a habit as slander, but in the over-exertion of the power of judging others. Criticism is natural and necessary, but it may so easily become mere

[1] Plummer in *I.C.C.* 'procured your being surrendered to him.'

[2] Similar warnings are to be found in Polycarp, Phil 5, addressed to deacons and widows.

disparagement. A good critic sees virtues as clearly as faults, but how common are critics who can see only defects.

This is unhealthy. But the worse that lies behind has been shown by the fate which made the word Devil come to include a great deal more. Your fault-finder becomes interested in evil, and in evil alone. That opens the door to all manner of corruption. It was Judas, whom our Lord stigmatized as a Diabolos, who grumbled at the waste of money, and went on to pilfer from the bag, and then to sell his Master.

I would venture to suggest that the danger, which is outlined in the career of the Accuser, was one of the three points on which our Lord was attacked in the Temptation. The suggestion that He should worship the Accuser, *i.e.* adopt him as His ideal, was not that He should choose evil to be His good. That would be no temptation to Him. But to Him, as to every leader of men, came the temptation to choose denunciation, and its attendant, anger, as His chief instrument, an instrument which holds out a prospect of quick and sweeping success. He set it aside, but how many, in the course of history, have yielded to the temptation, gained a whole world, lost their own souls, and wrought destruction instead of salvation.

A word of explanation needs to be given. The actual word Devil has been avoided in this paper, because of a confusion in our English versions. Devil has been used there, not only for Diabolos, the Accuser, but also for Daimon, the spirit of lunacy. This latter belongs to a different subject, which sorely needs the attention of some one who has thoroughly studied mental disease.[1] But, in the meantime, it is a curious fact that the insane are intensely suspicious, harbouring all manner of accusations against their fellow-men.

[1] I may, perhaps, be allowed to refer to my *Athanasian Creed* (T. & T. Clark), in which on pp. 128, 129 I have made a small contribution to the discussion of the matter.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

'Thank you for Jesus': A Christmas Talk.

By the Reverend S. Greer, M.A., Ayr.

'God so loved the world, that he gave his only . . . Son.'—Jn 3^{16}.

Christmas morning is surely the most thrilling in all the year. For days before there had been mysterious on-goings. Queer parcels had arrived only to be hurried out of sight immediately. You yourself had your surprises for Mummy and Daddy; what a job it was to keep them out of the way when you wanted to peep at them every moment! So you fall asleep, but full of excitement you awake in the dark. Is it morning yet? You hear voices downstairs. You cannot wait to see what is in your stocking. You creep to the foot of your bed; only just to *feel* it, of course! What is that lumpy thing at the top? It might be—indeed it must be—Yes, it *is* the very thing you had wanted. A thrilling morning is Christmas!

You see, this is the time of the year when we especially remember that God loves us so much that He gave us Jesus. And to-day we think of all that Jesus was, how He healed the sick, and taught the people about God, and, at the last, such was His love, He gave up His life, and in the end He rose from the dead. This morning we are saying, 'Thank you for Jesus.'

That is why we have Christmas gifts. We remember that God loves us, and we try to be kinder, for we feel that would please Him.

We have always felt that though we cannot give a present to Jesus Himself we can show our love for Him by doing something to make others happier. And that is what really makes Christmas. Every one tries to be kinder. Those who have quarrelled make it up. Even grumpy folk smile and look quite genial. People who have never spoken to one another before say 'Merry Christmas!' when they meet. In the streets and the buses shoppers jostle one another, but, instead of grousing, smile and make a joke of it. Indeed at Christmas we see how much better people would be if they always remembered Jesus, and said 'Thank You' for Him to God every day.

'What a pity Christmas doesn't come oftener,' you say with a sigh when it's all over. Yet, it might come every day. I don't mean the holly and mistletoe and crackers and Christmas pudding; perhaps we could only stand that once a year! I mean being kind and friendly and forgiving and smiling instead of grumbling. And Jesus tells us that we can say 'Thank You' to God in just that way. He says to us that every time we are helpful and loving and kind we are remembering Him in the way He likes most. So we don't need to wait till next December for another Christmas. We can have it almost at once, by catching the real spirit of it, which is not holly and crackers, but thoughtfulness for other folk and an endeavour to make them happier.

An old legend tells that in a certain ancient abbey there was preserved a most precious relic—the very swaddling clothes in which the Holy Infant was wrapped that first Christmas. These were only shown on special occasions, when men and women would kneel down before them. Now it happened that during such a moment one of the windows of the abbey was open, and while the people knelt a strong wind blew in, and to their astonished gaze the swaddling clothes were caught up and disappeared through the casement. The abbot and his clergy rushed from the building in pursuit of the garment as it was swept on by the wind. Through the city they followed it till it led them to a mean street, and here it vanished from sight, flying in at an open window. Up the stairs panted the clergy, and entering a humble abode beheld their holy relic swathed about the body of a new-born babe.

That is a real Christmas story, for it reminds us that Jesus, who loves little children, is filled with compassion for them when they suffer. And has He not said that we best show our love to Him when we are pitiful to those who are in pain or in trouble? That is one very real way in which to celebrate Christmas, and say 'Thank you for Jesus.'

Shall we not all decide that we will strive to be unselfish and kind, and that we will to-day do some kindness to another for His dear sake? There are the children in the hospitals; there are the evacuees. There is that boy whose people do not keep Christmas; they have nothing to keep it with. As you make up your mind to try to be loving and unselfish and helpful Jesus will be standing beside you with shining eyes. For the one birthday gift He wants most of all is that you should love and follow Him.

Victory V.

By the Reverend A. A. Mackenzie, B.D., Flemington, Victoria, Australia.

'This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'—1 Jn 5^4.

Of course, you know all about the 'V for Victory Campaign'—how everywhere people are using the letter V as a symbol of victory. They are writing it on walls and pavements, on envelopes and notices, and greeting one another with the first and second fingers spread apart. They are tapping it out with three dots and a dash on door knockers and shop counters. All this they are doing because in most, if not all, of the languages of the occupied countries of Europe, the word for victory or freedom begins with a V. Strangely enough, it does not do so in German, which makes it all the more suitable for the purpose.

Perhaps you have wondered what is the use of it all. Some say it is childish, like the Nazi greeting, 'Heil Hitler.' Well, it is what we call a 'psychological weapon.' It does not hurt the body like a sword or bullet, but works on the mind of the enemy. We are inclined to think it childish, because we live in a land of peace under our own rule. But the Nazis in occupied lands don't think it childish. Seeing V's reappear on walls as fast as they are rubbed out, and hearing them being tapped out on every hand at every hour of the day and night begins to frighten them. But it not only unnerves the Nazis, it cheers the subject peoples. It helps to keep their spirits up. It is the other side of that splendid rule for officers in the Royal Navy which says, 'No officer shall speak discouragingly to his mate, either in the watch or at mess, concerning the business on which he is engaged.' That rule means that every man should encourage his mate, and that is just what the sign of the V does.

In the paper a few weeks ago a man said that forty years ago he was a boy in a country post office and the postmaster tried to teach him the Morse Code. In order to help him remember the various signs he gave him a little jingle for each. And not to this day has he forgotten them. Here is the jingle for V as he gave it in the paper. 'Dit, dit, dit, DAH. Follow the star.' That reminded me of the men in the Bible who followed the star. You know what it led them to—to the cradle of the Infant Jesus. And there they bowed down and gave their gifts. They worshipped Him. Now, you and I have a star to follow, and it is that same Jesus Christ. In the first book of the New Testa-

ment we read of the wise men from the East following the star, and in the last book we read that our Lord speaks of Himself as 'the bright and morning star.' Just as the star long ago brought the three men from the East to the cradle of the Infant Christ, so to-day Jesus Himself is the Star that brings us to God. It is He that shows us God, that 'reveals' God to us.

So let the Lord Jesus Christ be your Star—your Leader and Guide. Serve Him, live in His company, and you'll come to know and to love God. And He will give you the victory over every temptation to do what is wrong. In the Gospels we read of a man who had a very hasty temper and a very selfish ambition, but he companied with Jesus and he gained the victory over his temper and his ambition. And long years after when he was an old man he wrote these words, 'Who is he that overcometh the world, but he that believeth that Jesus is the Son of God? This is the victory that overcometh the world, even our faith.'

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Watchman . . . what of the Night?

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE M. DRYBURGH, M.A., GLASGOW.

'Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night? The watchman said, The morning cometh, and also the night: if ye will enquire, enquire ye: return, come.'—Is $21^{11.\ 12}$.

The prophet pictures himself as standing on a watch-tower—the City of Jerusalem—from which he surveys all the surrounding nations. The period is the decade before 700 B.C. The nations who inhabited the region between what we now call Iran and the eastern Mediterranean Sea were chafing under the yoke of Assyria. The spirit of rebellion against this militaristic domination was spreading. At length, on the murder of Sargon, King of Assyria, in 705, the unrest broke out in a universal revolt. All sorts of intrigue went on, seeking to find methods of reclaiming liberty. For these consultations, Jerusalem, standing midway between Assyria and Egypt, was the natural centre. Its physical eminence on the hills lent support to the conception of it as a watch-tower, from which the doings of the period might be observed.

The times were, as I have indicated, uncertain. Over a wide area men's hearts failed them for fear. The Assyrian oppression had crushed the spirit of many, especially smaller peoples. There was no sign of the collapse of the mighty oppressor. Men wondered what the future would bring, as they looked up from their brokenness and despair. The prophet, as he stands on his watch-tower, surveying the tragic and baffling scene, seems to hear a cry from one of these peoples—the men of Edom: 'Watchman, what of the night?' That is, 'Watchman, how far is the night spent: how long till morning?' These men are weary of the long, drawn-out night of distress and anguish. They long for the first streaks of dawn, for the breaking of a new day and the passing away of the reign of darkness. They are weary, as the human heart always grows weary, of a long time of woe and gathering danger, that is unlit by any clear shining of hope. 'Watchman, what of the night?'

Is not that the very cry that is rising to-day from countless human hearts? We are now in the third year of this great world war. It is on a colossal scale and more complicated and far-reaching than any yet known in history. It is almost literally true to say that not a hamlet or a home in the world but is feeling, in some measure, the effect of the war. Force and Fear hang like a black night over the world. Filled with nausea and apprehension at the ghastliness and horror of what is happening, we cry, 'Watchman, what of the night—how long till morning?' We feel exactly the same about things as the men of Isaiah's day. We are embroiled in a universal unrest: we long to see the passing of the night and the breaking of a new day.

But, notice the answer given by the prophet-watchman—'The morning cometh and also the night. If ye will enquire, enquire ye: Return, come.' It is an obscure answer and does not bring the satisfaction the men of Edom sought. And we must admit it does not satisfy us. Many questions rise in our minds about this war, questions we could ask with some heat. We demand definite answers, but none are given. None of us, for example, appears to have done anything to bring about this terrible welter of cruelty. Why is such a thing allowed to happen? None of us wants it to go on, yet none of us can stop it. The fact is that this war is part of the evil of the world, the evil, which, in manifold forms, is rampant through human history. 'No one,' says a Church of Scotland Report on the situation, 'can live through these days without a growing conviction that something much deeper is being decided than a contest between nations. The present conflict must be viewed in the light of the fundamental

struggle between Good and Evil going on continually in every nation and in every man.' Naturally, we often wonder when it will all come to an end. How long will the night of the world's distress last? Let us listen to two notes struck by the prophet in his answer to the cry 'What of the night?'

First, he says, 'The morning cometh, and also the night.' The night will pass, as every night does. This war will come to an end, as every other war has done. Every war, every time of stress and woe, has seemed long and wearisome to those who had to live through it. But the night will pass: the morning cometh.

For while the tired waves, vainly breaking,
Seem here no painful inch to gain,
Far back, through creeks and inlets making,
Comes silent, flooding in, the main.

And not by eastern windows only,
When daylight comes, comes in the light,
In front, the sun climbs slow, how slowly,
But westward, look, the land is bright.

Yet, on the other hand, we are not to imagine that, when this time of trouble is over, that will be perfect day and that all the shadows and trials of life will have passed away for ever. There will be other nights. In the very hour when Mary's soul was filled with joy and thanksgiving at God's wonderful visitation in her life, old Simeon said to her, 'Yea, a sword shall pierce through thy own soul also.' 'The morning cometh, and also the night.'

We are not to imagine that when the war is over that will be heaven. Let us realize that, while the coming of a new day of peace may bring relief and joy to some, to countless human hearts it will bring nights of loneliness and sorrow and adversity and pain. Some will rejoice, others will weep. Yes, we shall, I believe, win this war: the night, though it will be very black yet awhile, will pass and the day of world-peace will break upon mankind. Enslaved lands will be liberated. The morning cometh. But let us not delude ourselves that if the war ceased to-night all would be well. The post-war world will be bristling with very difficult problems. The powers of darkness will not be banished from the earth. Tanks and aeroplanes, necessary as they are to deal with Germany, cannot deal the death-blow at spiritual wickedness at work in human hearts everywhere. 'The morning cometh, and also the night.'

And so the prophet watchman goes on to the second part of his answer, saying that the men of Edom must come back again to make inquiry. There is no final answer at present: the vision is not clear. And what he said to the men of Edom must be said to us. 'The Flanders campaign of 1940 was a tragedy, redeemed by a heroic superhuman conclusion,' writes Ian Hay in *The Battle of Flanders*; but he goes on, 'The day of victory is not yet, and may not fall for some time. . . .' The problem of the night of the world's anguish is perennial and so must be our coming to inquire of God, to seek His mind, His help, His guidance. If the morning cometh and also the night, if trials are not all to disappear with each new triumph, then we must seek God's help not only once, not only on National Days of Prayer and other special occasions, but day after day and week after week. This war is raising scores of problems, dangers, temptations not only for the world, but for every one of us and for our homes. We cannot solve all the problems at once or by occasional appeals to God. I hope we shall be summoned to Days of Prayer and Services of Dedication. But do not let us be superstitious and imagine, as some seem to do by their presence in Church only on such occasions and at no other time, that such Days are going to reveal to us all we want to know.

When such high and sacred occasions are over, the problems are going to remain: battles will still have to be fought: losses will still have to be endured: air-raids will go on: difficulties and trials will still remain in your life and in mine. And therefore, God, the great Watchman, whose eye is upon all men and all nations, who sees the end from the beginning, who, at these special times, hears our prayer and knows the anxiety of our heart, says, 'Come back again. You will need My help again and again: and always I will be ready to give it.' God, if I may put it so, is a Realist: He knows that hard and difficult days and nights lie ahead: He knows we do not yet see clearly when or how the great conflict will end and that we have much yet to endure. And that is why He says, 'Come back again and inquire of Me. Ask of Me fresh vision and strength. Ask a renewal of your faith. Ask fresh forgiveness of your sins and new power to face temptation. Ask again and again for courage to face danger. Ask to be kept free from selfish fears and from hatred and bitterness. Ask for the spirit of love and for a great trust. These are things you will need not once but again and again: therefore, Return, come again. Ask, and ye shall receive: seek, and ye shall find: knock, and it shall be opened unto you.'

FOURTH SUNDAY IN ADVENT.

Christian Joy.

'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'—Jn 16^{33}.

Do you know that there occurs in the New Testament no less than seventy times a word which is sometimes rendered in our English version, 'rejoice,' and sometimes 'be of good cheer'? Now there must be significance in that fact. In truth it is sometimes only a word of greeting, such as we toss to a friend on the other side of the road. At other times it is a salutation that accompanies a letter. But, even if its use is not infrequently conventional, yet there are many occasions when it is positive in its challenge and in its appeal, so that we are compelled to ask the question: Is it possible that this emphasis on joy in the pages of the New Testament means that in Christ we are made participators in a joy which has a deeper source and therefore a greater permanence than any that the world can offer?

Now that is an extraordinarily important question, because it is generally acknowledged that a man never does any job so well as when he does it joyfully. Are not the toilers of modern Germany being called to great endeavours and to great sacrifices by the motto, 'power through joy'? If, therefore, deep and lasting joy is the condition of valiant, gallant, often unselfish living, we must seek out the nature and the validity of Christian joy. Let us try to make plain to ourselves the reasons why we lose our joy in life.

And, surely, the first thing we must admit is that we are liable to lose it for the most trivial of reasons. The more we read history, the more we realize that great events and influential movements have often been directed, nay, even controlled, by the operation of what we are liable to call trifles. A stray word, a casual meeting, an unexpected sight, an unforeseen and unpredictable circumstance—these have often been the means by which statesmen have been moved, destinies have been shaped, searchers have been guided, and schemers have been foiled. Victor Hugo tells us how Waterloo was won, because on the morning of the battle there fell a heavy shower of rain, which prevented Napoleon from getting his guns into position until almost midday. Now, if details are liable to play so important a part in national history, their influence is no less real in the personal history of individual men and women. Our joy in life may very easily be dispelled for the most trivial reasons. Some one said something that was disturbing, or did something that annoyed us. Our honour was offended, our patience taxed, or a strain upon our willingness to forgive. At once our peace was disturbed, our joy was gone, and we wore upon our faces that look of excessive annoyance, which those affect who are distressed over a trifle. 'Be of good cheer,' said a friend. We were ready to break forth in a petulant outburst, when we caught sight of the whimsical, pitying smile upon his face, and we were recalled to sanity. We had been hugging our little grief to our bosom in a luxury of self-pity, and we but needed some one to bring us to our senses, and to sober us again.

But sometimes a man's sadness may have a deeper root. His experience in life over a period may have been so harrowing and devastating that he has lost faith in his fellow-men. Formerly he had accepted them as honourable and friendly, accustomed to play the game, not over-sympathetic, but not coldly callous. Now he has suffered at their hands: the wounds are deep; his spirit becomes embittered; henceforth he is suspicious and resentful. Who is there who can go to such an one and say, 'Rejoice,' and not be driven away, his errand vain? Only some great soul who can revive his trust in humanity, who, by his own righteousness, and sincerity and love, can make such an impact of confidence upon his mind that the suspicions are banished, and the fears are done away. It was Sir John Seeley who said: 'It is not absolutely necessary to humanity that a man shall have seen many men whom he can respect. The most lost cynic will get a new heart by learning thoroughly to believe in the virtue of one man. Our estimate of human nature is in proportion to the best specimen of it we have witnessed.'

And there is the man who has been tempted to lose faith in God, the person whose experiences seem to him to deny the possibility of a loving Father—Job and the Job-like, and those who experience a like suffering, while they can lay no claim to a like integrity, and that great host who suffer and try to bear. For these also the New Testament has a word which is sometimes rendered 'Rejoice,' but it is a different word, a strong word, a demanding word, which has the force of 'dare, be confident and courageous.' Dr. Albert Mackinnon in one of his books tells of the catacombs in ancient Rome, where the Christians met for worship; and what he says is very remarkable: 'Mustiness may be suggested by the words, "The buried records of the catacombs"; but that is one of the surprises which I have in store for you;

instead there is an invigorating breeziness. Though these records were written in the darkest hour of history there is not a dull page in one of them, not even a sigh between the lines. What astonished me most is the exuberant joy which every day leaves its traces on those shadowed walls. Whatever our virtues or failings, a few hours in the library of the greatest optimists who ever lived will do us all good.' It is here that the New Testament speaks with power. Under the Old Covenant many of the children of Israel had looked forward, with keen expectancy, to the coming days of joyfulness and prosperity, when suffering and oppression would be no more. And we know that that passionate hope of theirs can be fully appreciated by us only when we remember that they lived in Palestine, land of foreign invasion. It was inevitable that they should long for a happy release; and yet their desire appears often to have been for personal comfort. Then into that atmosphere of material expectancy came the Christ, with the sobering teaching that His disciples might often expect in this world extreme physical discomfort. He taught that God often uses men exhaustingly. On the Cross He demonstrated it, for He who had stumbled neath the weight of His Cross did not need a blow from a Roman soldier to accomplish His release. And how many of Christ's disciples have had a share of the same exhausting service. To take a modern example, we remember that great hero of the faith, General Booth, who at the age of eighty, suffering daily agonies and growing ever more blind, continued to direct his forces. But the greatly-notable thing about them all is that, in spite of what they had to endure, they had a joy which seemed to be indestructible. It was manifestly a joy that could triumph over all earthly vicissitudes, that could overwhelm the pains and distresses which were their portion in a hostile environment. 'Beloved, think it not strange concerning the fiery trial that cometh upon you to prove you, as though some strange thing happened to you; but rejoice inasmuch as ye are partakers of Christ's sufferings; that when his glory shall be revealed, ye may be glad also with exceeding joy.' It is the joy of a man of faith.

As Richard King says: 'To have suffered deeply, to have endured and kept one's faith, is surely to have stood in the presence of God Himself. And without that presence, joy and triumph is but a hollow thing, however much those who pass by on the laughing side of life may deny it, crying out, "Give us fun in our time, O Lord!" For just as the world turns towards us a smiling face when things are going well, so at the same time God seems at that moment to turn away—or maybe the truth is that we turn away from Him. It is only when we stand alone in the Garden of Gethsemane that we really find that God is standing by our side.'

Joy such as this, permanent and imperturbable, is not a seasonal luxury, is not a fugitive sensation, but is a fruit of the spirit in those whose spirits rest in God. That is why the ultimate word for 'rejoice' in the New Testament is a strong word. It is a summons to faithful valour, and to cheerful service. 'Be of good cheer; I have overcome the world.'[1]

Christmas Day.

The Song that Never Dies.

By the Reverend R. J. Wedderspoon, M.A., Pollokshields, Glasgow.

'Glory to God in the highest,
And on earth peace among men in whom he is well pleased.'—Lk 2^{14} (R.V.).

'Our Christmas this year will be more shadowed than ever,' remarked a friend to me recently, and I perfectly understood, as we all do, what the speaker intended to convey. It seems, on the face of it, rather absurd to be singing the Angel Song, and to be talking of Peace and Goodwill, when half the countries of Europe are laid waste by war, and the whole world gripped by fear. This is the third successive Christmas of a devastating world war, and it is bound to be shadowed when we contrast what is with what might have been. Our jubilation, the natural concomitant of the season, cannot be other than restrained, when we reflect upon the tragedies already accomplished, the sorrow already wrought, the homes already made desolate. It is the sanctity of the home that modern war seems to invade and destroy most, and Christmas is the great Festival of Home.

Yes, this Christmas is in many ways bound to be shadowed, its festivities restrained, its entertainments rather hollow, if we have any emotion left in our hearts at all. But not the Church's Christmas! The Church is more sympathetic than any other society of people with all the sufferers in every land, and in all their griefs she has a share. Yet Christian men and women everywhere find it all the more binding upon them to declare with a happy exultancy at this season what they know Christ's coming to the world to mean. The

[1] J. Mauchline in *The Professor as Preacher*, 137.

secondary and the non-essential features of the Christmas celebrations may be dispensed with: the primary purpose of the festival stands out all the more clearly. Our songs are quite unrestrained as we recognize again God's decisive act, realize afresh that the Governor of the universe is not aloof and remote, heedless and indifferent, but active, living, near, and discover anew what a mighty reinforcement of courage the Christmas message, properly apprehended, brings. The Angel Song is not stifled. It was not stifled in the beginning: it cannot be stifled now.

1. *The Angel Song survives while the dominant world powers perish.*

Go back to that first singing of the Angel Song. Think of the circumstances in which it was sung. We like to picture the scene as a gentle pastoral. There were the shepherds watching over their flocks in all the quiet beauty of an Eastern night; the countryside all peaceful, a perfect setting for an angel choir.

> 'Still the night, holy the night,
> Sleeps the world:'

That is how we idealize the scene. But the actual conditions were far different. Palestine was a subjugated province of the great Roman Empire. Its inhabitants moved uneasily under the yoke of an alien domination. They subjected themselves unwillingly to Rome's Imperial decrees. Indeed, it was when Mary and Joseph had gone from Nazareth to Bethlehem to register for the Imperial census that Mary's Child was born. There had been a long history of wars and rumours of wars, and there were desperate men eager to avail themselves of the opportunity to throw off their yoke, if ever such opportunity might present itself. It was over this cauldron of seething passions that the Angel Song first rang out: it was into this maelstrom of whirling and contending enmities that the child Jesus was born. There followed a hurried evacuation, and soon we read of a Massacre of the Innocents. The more, indeed, we study the events of that first Christmas, the more striking does the resemblance to our own days become. But, in spite of everything, the music of the angelic choir was heard, and the Christ child came to birth.

H. W. Nevinson, the famous journalist who has just died, tells a story of his experience during the relief of Pretoria in the South African War. He describes the scene as Lord Roberts rode in at the head of the British troops. It was a day of great British triumph. But as Mr. Nevinson rode away from the scene, down one of the broad streets of the town, there came from one of the Boer houses the sound of music. Some one of the defeated race was playing Beethoven. 'It was the last movement of the "Waldstein" Sonata, which, after an interval of hesitation and apparent defeat, bursts into full gaiety and joy. "Do your worst," the music seemed to say. Let your Generals, and your battalions, your guns and your horsemen, with all their power and glory, with the thunder of your captains, and the shouting, do your worst! I am something beyond your reach, something whose perfection will endure after all your cheering is silent, your throbbing blood is dry, and even the humiliation of the defeated is forgotten.'

Transfer your thoughts to Palestine, to the Roman Empire and the Angel Song. What remains? 'Imperial Cæsar dead and turned to clay.' Imperial Rome? A study for the historian. The Herods and the petty princelings? They are but tiny figures in a very small alcove of the great historical gallery. Only the song remains! It remains, for it is the indestructible song, celebrating the coming to our earth of Him whose Personality and Power are likewise indestructible.

2. *The Angel Song survives because it bears witness to God's great decisive act.*

It might sometimes appear as if the course of history were determined by happenings quite fortuitous. When John Bright was born, we are told, the nurse carried him in her arms, not knowing whether he were living or dead. A strong fidelity to duty may save an infant life, as a momentary carelessness may lose it. But there was nothing fortuitous about the coming to life of the infant Christ. It was in 'the fulness of the time' that He came, at the decisive moment in the human story. Behind Him and with Him were all the powers of Divine Creation expressing themselves in a yearning love for the souls of men. As Browning puts it,

> Never was so plain a truth
> As that God drops His seed of Heavenly flame
> Just where He wills on earth.

It was the will of the Father that Christ should come, and, ever since He came, we have known that in the long struggle against evil we have an invincible ally. Christmas witnesses to our belief in a God who identified Himself with man, a God who knows, and cares, and understands. The ultimate triumph of goodness and the emergence of

cosmos from chaos are assured by the fact which Christmas commemorates, by the entrance of the Divine power to live and work among men. Not because 'God's in his heaven,' but because at Christmas God came down to His earth, will all be ultimately right with the world.

How decisive for the final triumph of righteousness Christ's coming was, the attacks made upon Him by the forces of evil clearly attest. While He was still an infant Herod sought to put Him to death, and to stay the process of man's salvation at its very inception. Ever since then a succession of Herods have made the attempt to dethrone Him. If only they could limit His power, or diminish His authority, or annihilate His Church, or destroy His Kingdom! If only they could abolish the Angel Song! But He remains, our Guardian, our Saviour, in a manner more real than we had ever thought possible, confronting our modern Herod to-day with all that 'weakness of God that is stronger than men.'

In his book, *Hitler Speaks*, Walter Rauschning has recorded the proud boasts of the modern Herod. 'The religions are all alike, no matter what they call themselves: they have no future. Fascism, if it likes, may come to terms with the Church. So shall I. Why not? That will not prevent me from tearing up Christianity root and branch, and annihilating it in Germany.' Is it not Herod to the life? Is it not the same vain attempt to deny the decisive and triumphant act of God? They are indeed foolhardy who make bold to flout His declared will and purpose, and to stifle the Angel Song.

3. *The Angel Song survives because it strikes a responsive chord in every human heart.*

Do we not too often make the mistake of imagining that the gospel message requires all manner of extraneous support? We construct massive outworks; we have our theological buttresses; we build strong philosophical redoubts; we deploy vast regiments of highly trained defenders of the Faith. Cannot we trust God's message to make its own way, the Angel Song to find its own lodging in the human heart? We have a certain sympathy with Sir Charles Oman, the historian, who informed his philosophy tutor at Oxford that he 'hated the idea of pulling up the foundations of ethics by philosophical inquiry, or analyzing his religious instincts.' He tells us, in his *Memories of Victorian Oxford*, 'that he was a Conservative and a churchman, and did not want to have his principles or his conscience explained away.'

When we are face to face with the great fact of the Incarnation, it is easy for the philosopher, or for the avowed sceptic, to propound difficulties. One thing, however, is clear. The quite uninstructed soul recognizes the Divine; the Angel Song awakens echoes in every heart. The very bitterness of war makes us the more ready to recognize the Prince of Peace. For it is Peace that all the world longs for this Christmas season, and Christian men and women know that, however the coming of Peace among the nations may be delayed, there need be no stay of execution so far as obtaining Christ's own gift of individual peace is concerned. Possessed of this peace, a peace which may subsist at the heart of endless agitation, we too can make our Christmas response to the Angel Song.

First Sunday after Christmas Day.

Providence and the Incarnation.

By the Reverend A. E. Garvie, M.A., D.D., D.Th., London.

'The light shineth in the darkness; and the darkness apprehended (or overcame, R.V.m.) it not.'—Jn 1^5 (R.V.).

'When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son.'—Gal 4^4 (R.V.).

I.

The association of Christmas Day and New Year's Day may at first sight appear only as one of the Calendar, their nearness in date. What Christmas means is known in all Christendom; but not so universal is the significance attaching for the Christian mind to New Year's Day; the dating of the one is traditional, and probably incorrect or at least rests on no convincing evidence, the dating of the other seems altogether arbitrary, as there is no evidence of decisive physical change between the last day of December and the first of January.

A little consideration may modify our judgment. When the shortest day is past, and the days begin to lengthen, Nature seems to make a fresh start, the winter sleep is beginning to end, and the spring awakening to begin, at least in promise and potency in so far as the sun is earth's light and life bringer. If Nature then makes a fresh start, may we not be reminded thereby of God's presence in all its processes, and control of all its laws, and extending our view from Nature to man, may we not let our thoughts dwell on His Providence in human history. His purpose in and control of the confusions and conflicts, the discernments and the achievements in

the ways and works of man? By many Christians New Year's Day is fittingly used as an occasion for remembrance of the goodness and grace of God in the past, and of self-dedication to God for the future: as the day marks the swift flight of time, reflection and aspiration rise to the eternal God, who is our refuge, and whose everlasting arms are underneath us. As the dating of New Year's Day is not so arbitrary as it might seem, so is there a solemn and sacred significance attached to it.

May not our thought follow the same path regarding Christmas? It is fitting to remember at the time, when in Nature the light begins to overcome the darkness, the rise on the horizon of human history of the Incarnate Word of God, the eternal light that had been shining in darkness, unapprehended yet not overcome (see R.V.m. of Jn 1^5). The beauty of the Story of the Nativity may so absorb interest in and fix attention on the details, the mother and the babe, the stable and the manger, the shepherds and the wise men, that the truth embodied in the tale may not be invested with its full significance; the Word or the Son of God became flesh, man in all the conditions and limitations of human nature, experience, character. Christmas Day speaks to us of the Incarnation of God, very God and true man one in that Babe in Bethlehem, and New Year's Day of the Providence of God, His direction and control of Nature and history. There is a fitness in the close association in date, as there is in their significance: the consideration I want next to develop is the relation between Providence and the Incarnation.

II.

If, as the historical Faith of Christendom affirms, God became man in the Babe in Bethlehem, that event does not only belong to God's Providence as His presence and activity in the order of Nature and the course of history for the fulfilment of His purpose, but may be regarded as the supreme instance of His Providence, the consummation of His purpose, and accordingly the clue to guide us through what may often seem a labyrinth for thought, the explanation of the antecedent preparation for the event, no less than of the consequent results. The season of Advent is by many regarded and used as a call to study and meditation on what has been described as the *præparatio evangelica*, for when 'the fulness of the time came, God sent forth his Son' (Gal 4^4). It has become 'current coin' in Christian thought to find this preparation, not only in the religion of the Jews, but also in the culture and language of Greece, and the law and order of Rome. Jesus Himself claimed that He had come, not to destroy, but to fulfil law and prophecy; and that fulfilment lies not so much in any correspondence of predictions and events, as in the completion in the Son's Revelation of the Father of the progressive revelation of God in the prophetic succession, in their 'ethical monotheism.' Although, contrary to the teaching of the Holy Scriptures an exclusive dogmatism denies any general revelation of God in other religions, many scholars by their studies, and many missionaries by their experience have been led to recognize a preparation for Christ in the religions of the world, the needs these disclose and the inadequacy of the means they offer to meet these. Wherever and whenever men have sought God, He has been found, for He was seeking them in their search, limited and imperfect as was their capacity to receive and to respond to His approach and appeal. I want to add to these instances another, the preparation in general history, as known to us, for the history of the Hebrew nation, the condition for and the occasion of the divine revelation in law and prophecy, fulfilled in Christ.

III.

The prophets were not abstract theologians, meditating in their studies on the timeless divine reality; but they were men of their time, reading the signs of their time, and their utterances were tracts for their time: inspired by God they discerned and disclosed God's nature, character, and purpose in the events and experiences of the present hour. Men were not puppets of God's power, but agents of His purpose for His people, Assyria the rod of His anger, and Cyrus the anointed to carry out His mercy in deliverance. In the earlier chapters of the book of Amos Yahveh, the covenant-God of Israel, is declared to be the Judge of all the nations: one after another of the peoples that come within his political horizon is summoned to the bar to be condemned for an offence against humanity.

It is not the whole world that comes under the prophetic survey. The ancient civilizations of Japan, China, and India do not, except for casual allusions, come into their world, neither do the peoples of Africa except the North on the shores of the Mediterranean nor America. The then unknown lands were within God's Providence, but they are not brought into relation with what may surely be described as the focal purpose of God's

revelation of Himself in history. Yet how comprehensive that prophetic horizon is! What some archæologists regard as the original source of all the culture diffused throughout the Ancient World —Egypt—was the pre-natal environment of the Hebrew nations brought to birth in the Wilderness wanderings. Did Moses, the founder under God's Providence and by His inspiration of the religion as well as the nation, owe nothing to the culture of Egypt, whether by aversion or assimilation? Was not Egypt the womb in which the embryo of the nation was developed? In the later history, the crises of the nation's outward lot were the occasions for the advance of its inward life as evoking and we might even say provoking prophetic activity, the organ of the revelation preparatory for that of the Son?

To mention some instances, the Assyrians' overthrow of the Northern, and invasion of the Southern Kingdom elicited the witness of Amos, Hosea, Isaiah, and Micah, and the Babylonian of Jeremiah: in the Exile Ezekiel's priestly prophetic activity was stimulated. The divine intention in the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus was proclaimed by the unnamed prophet, usually described as the Deutero-Isaiah, as in our canon his writings are included in the same book as those of the earlier prophet, Isaiah of Jerusalem. As has already been noted, the diffusion of the Greek culture and language by the conquests of Alexander had a great influence on the spread of the gospel, and the growth of Christian theology. Rome provided the political sphere of the diffusion of Christianity in the early centuries, and also the ecclesiastical model in the consolidation of the Church. These Empires rose, flourished, and fell, the Hebrew nation continued, and the spiritual treasure of which its contact with these Empires was the occasion when it too ceased as such, was inherited by the Christian Church, of which a similar tale of God's providence in the history of nations, by which it has been affected, could be told.

In the world-wide crisis of our own day, when the ruin, or the recovery of Christian civilization, morals, and religion seems to be as yet the undecided issue, is it not well that our faith in God's Providence now as hitherto should by the grateful contemplation of the past reinforce our hope that the day is coming, when the love God's grace imparts will overcome all the hates that nationalism or racialisms or any other 'isms may breed in the hearts of men? If Germany be the 'rod of His anger,' dare we hope that Britain will be the Cyrus of His mercy to the nations?

Second Sunday after Christmas Day.

Life and Peace.

By the Reverend Roderick Bethune, M.A., Aberdeen.

'To be spirtually minded is life and peace.'—Ro 8^{6}.

The present tense of the verb in this text, 'To be spiritually minded *is* life and peace,' is worth noting. It is interesting and instructive in view of the charges sometimes preferred against religion in general and Christianity in particular.

It has been alleged, and not always by unlearned and ignorant men, that Christianity has little interest in this present world, that it has nothing to give men in return for loyalty except the promise of manifold blessings in some remote Heaven. That Christianity has an interest in another world and has declared that all who have followed the light as they have seen it in Jesus will some day receive the just reward of deeds done in the body is true. But that it is concerned only with another world and that its devotees must await their transference to Heaven before gathering the fruits of their loyalty is a distortion of the facts. Christianity is keenly interested in this present world and has a contribution to make to men whose life in it is sometimes far from easy. That is the point which this text seeks to emphasize—'To be spiritually minded is life and peace.' Blessings can be enjoyed here and now.

I was recently struck by a reference to this fact in Professor Pringle-Pattison's book, *The Idea of Immortality*. As the title indicates, the writer is concerned with the Christian hope of a world to come in which there will be neither sorrow nor crying, neither pain nor death. In dealing with his theme, however, Professor Pringle-Pattison is careful to declare that the gospel Jesus 'proclaimed was not a promise of future reward for certain beliefs about Himself, but, as every genuinely religious message must be, a gospel of deliverance, a message of present salvation: "Come unto me," said Jesus, "all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me; for I am meek and lowly in heart: and ye shall find rest unto your souls."' What Jesus offered could be enjoyed in this present life wherever a man was situated, in whatever circumstances he chanced to be.

With that in mind, suppose we consider the two blessings which Paul declares are the consequence of spiritual-mindedness — life and peace. Could you name two blessings more attractive to men

than these, two more worthy to be sought and obtained? In very truth they are what every man seeks and seeks with all his heart. They are to be found, says Paul, in loyalty to Jesus and in loyalty to Jesus alone. Suppose we think about such a claim.

1. *To be spiritually minded,* he says first of all, *is life.* By that, I take it, Paul meant that only as a man trusted in Jesus, rested upon His declarations and fulfilled His behests, could life retain its interest and a man fulfil his duties gladly and confidently to the very end.

Now the plain fact is that life does not retain its interest for all of us, nor are we always in the frame of mind to discharge our tasks gladly and confidently. The prominent psychiatrist, Jung, once declared that all of his patients above thirty-five were suffering, at bottom, from one cause: Their life had no meaning to them. When one reaches that stage, one is apt to resort to some external aids which promise to drive dull care away and in its place to put a certain zest for life. Pleasure of one sort or another is sought, entertainment of various kinds is participated in, all in an endeavour to possess that elusive something which makes all the difference between interest and no interest in life. Pleasure and entertainment, taken in moderation, are good and have an unquestioned contribution to make to life, but as on this occasion Paul felt justified in warning men who felt that life was to be found only in questionable pleasures, that a disappointment awaited them, so it would behove us to be careful of what we expect from external aids however legitimate and worthy they may be. Pleasure and entertainment, cheerful friends and interesting books can do much when we are cast down and depressed, but their influence is, at best, limited. Paul realized, and realized correctly, that, if life is to retain its interest, if it is to be lived with zest to the very end, what we most need is a proper adjustment to it, not so much external aids as a certain attitude.

And was he not right? When Jesus came preaching His gospel He declared that He had come to give men life and to give them life more abundant; and, if the New Testament is reliable, He fully implemented His promise. Men and women who had been seeking life along certain channels and whose search had proved unavailing, began with Jesus to find life more interesting than they had ever done. And how did Jesus achieve such miracles? Not by prescribing more pleasure or entertainment, but by adjusting men to life. He brought some who felt that life must be devoted to selfish pleasure if it was to yield anything to see the great purposes in whose service it might be spent. He brought others who had looked upon their fellows as tools to be used to their own advantage to see them as fellow-mortals in need of help and encouragement. He brought others who had suffered loss and who on that account had lost their zest for life to see that over all a good God ruled and that some day His purposes would be fully revealed. To read the New Testament is to come on almost every page upon some one who is deriving from life the utmost that life has to give.

All of which bears serious consideration, not only on the part of those who are young and who have been wrongly persuaded that loyalty to Jesus means only a series of denials resulting in the opposite of life, but also on the part of those who are older and for whom life sometimes lacks meaning and who find themselves performing their tasks awkwardly and unwillingly. How often, under pressure of present events, when what we value is subjected to audacious assault and those whom we love and respect are crushed by an evil force, does the possible meaninglessness of life in general and of our own life in particular haunt us and rob us of all desire to discharge duties whose fulfilment was once the breath of our life? The only way, at such a time, in which we can recover our zest for life is by seeking and cultivating the company of Jesus until we begin to see life and the world through His eyes, learn afresh from Him our significance to God and God's passionate desire for the whole world's salvation. Of these two facts indeed most of us in days like the present require to be sure. And only One can make us sure of them. 'To be spiritually minded,' said Paul, 'is life.' And Paul was right.

2. *To be spiritually minded,* he said again, *is peace.* The combination is interesting. Some men find what they think is life, but, together with it, they fail to find peace. To be spiritually minded, says Paul, is life *and* peace. The kind of life that is found is the kind of life that results in peace.

It may be that, for some who are young, the offer of peace has little attraction. Their desire for peace, they feel, may come with increasing years, but meantime they want adventure wherever adventure is to be found and at whatever cost it has to be purchased. Others, may I remind such, have felt as they meantime are feeling, some of those, indeed, to whom Paul addressed this letter; and if their experience teaches us anything it is this, that there are certain activities in life which, though for the moment pleasurable, result in

unrest and dispeace which beggar description. It was to save men from such a fate that Paul declared that to be spiritually minded is peace, that among the greatest and cleanest things in life adventure is to be found, participation in which carries with it neither regret nor the dispeace which is born of regret. And he spoke from experience. None that we can name in any age tasted more adventure than Paul did in the service of Jesus Christ, none had a life more full of thrills than he, and because, together with adventure, he also found peace in Jesus, he was anxious that others should find their freedom in the service of such a Master.

It may be, however, that besides those who are not at first attracted by Paul's declaration, there are others who *are* attracted by it because of some lack of peace within their souls. It may be that within their lives there is a constant conflict between good and evil, as there was, he himself confesses, within the life of the apostle to the Gentiles. It may be that there is a certain restlessness of spirit because of present conditions and because of the fear of what may happen in the future. *The* thing above all things which such desire in such a case is peace. Sometimes they may have sought it in this distraction or in that, in more restful surroundings than those in which their lifework must be performed, but always it somehow eludes them and the conflict and the restlessness remain.

It is to such Paul speaks, and speaks with the authority of one who participated in this very quest and succeeded in gaining his heart's desire. Peace, he reminds us, is dependent not upon external circumstances so much as upon an inward attitude. And if we are disposed to question his statement, mustn't we bear in mind the most peaceful, the most balanced, the least fretful life that was ever lived? Jesus lacked all the conditions we believe most conducive to peace—comfort, leisure, freedom from onerous duty—yet none had ever the atmosphere of peace about his life that He had nor was ever any one less affected by distressing outward circumstances. The secret of His peace lay not in anything external, in none of the artificial aids to which we sometimes resort in search of peace, but in an inward attitude, in a constant consciousness of God, in as constant a remembrance of what He meant to God and of God's love for Him. 'My peace,' He said to His disciples at the last, with nothing of material value in His possession to bequeath to them, yet realizing that what He had to give was beyond reckoning to men who shared the common struggles which are the common penalty of our common manhood, 'My peace I give unto you'—in other words, the secret of His own poise and balance. And how often, facing great odds, had His disciples reason to be grateful for that parting gift!

How often do many of us, knowing the conflict within ourselves which Paul confessed he knew, knowing, if not the circumstances which faced the disciples, others equally arduous, forget that the gift first offered to the disciples is ours, too, for the taking. Pleasure and entertainment, cheerful friends and interesting books can do much for us situated as we are to-day, but, while none would minimize their contribution to our life, their influence upon us is at best limited. The truth is that, if round our restlessness we would be conscious of rest, we must become increasingly spiritually minded, increasingly careful to keep our trysts with the world's only Saviour, until we begin to share His very consciousness of God, until the significance of the individual to God and God's passionate desire for the world's salvation take possession of our hearts and minds.

Recent Biblical Archaeology.

By the Reverend J. W. Jack, D.D., Glenfarg, Perthshire.

Israelite Baking Methods.

After finishing the grinding, the women set themselves to the baking, which was usually done at the house. The meal, whether barley, wheat, or other kinds, having been kneaded in a shallow wooden trough or basin (cf. Ex 8^3 12^{34}), was divided up into 'cakes' or 'scones' ready for the oven. The fuel required was made of stubble (Mal 4^1), bundles of dry twigs (1 K 17^{12}), grass (Mt 6^{30}), and the like, or sometimes of cattle or camels' dung (Heb. *gêl* or *galal*, cf. Ezk $4^{12.\ 15}$) mixed with chopped straw.

1. The simplest kind of 'oven,' affording also

the quickest method of baking, was one which is still used by the Bedouin or dwellers in the desert, who have to be prepared for rapidity of movement. It consisted of one or more large flat stones, on which the fire was lit (cf. Gn 18^6). After a time the smouldering embers were removed, the burning area was carefully cleaned, and the portions of dough (Heb. *bâṣêq*) were placed on it. When the under-side had been sufficiently baked, they were turned over (cf. Hos 7^8) and covered with hot ashes to complete the process. The 'cake of hot stones' (Heb. *'ugat reṣâfim*, 1 K 19^6 R.V.m.), which formed the meal of Elijah in the desert of Beersheba, was of this nature.

2. A portable apparatus which was frequently used consisted of a large circular plate of beaten iron, called *sâǧ* by the Arabs. This, which was not unlike a Scotch girdle, was placed on three large stones, the fire was placed beneath it, and the hot surface (slightly convex) was then spread with the flat round pieces of dough. In this primitive way, fairly thick 'scones' or 'bannocks'—the 'loaf' of the Old and New Testaments (cf. the 'tumbling cake of barley bread,' Jg 7^{13})—could be produced, as well as very thin pancakes or 'wafers' (cf. Ex 16^{31}, etc.). Such a utensil, when turned over, made a useful frying-pan, which was often used at feasts or merry-making parties to prepare cakes kneaded with oil or butter. The iron plate (Heb. *maḥabath barzel*), mentioned in Ezk 4^3, was no doubt of this nature and it played a prominent rôle in the ritual connected with grain-offering (cf. Lv 2^5 R.V. 6^{14} R.V. 7^9 R.V., 1 Ch 23^{29} R.V.). The pan or dish used by Tamar for baking her cakes (2 S 13^9) seems to have been of a similar kind. The earthenware plates (perforated like the pans used for roasting chestnuts) which were discovered by Macalister at Gezer in layers of the Late Bronze and Early Iron Ages (*c.* 1600–900 B.C.), and which show evident traces of fire,[1] may also have been a type of *sâǧ*.

3. At the present day the fellaḥs or tillers of the soil make much use of the *ṭâbîm*, a kind of large earthenware bowl turned upside-down on a stony hearth. The bell-shaped surface is provided with an opening at the top, which can be stopped with a movable lid. The fuel is heaped round the exterior, and the cakes of dough are introduced through the opening on to the heated hearth, and the opening is then closed. This utensil is probably not earlier than the Arab age, though certain of its characteristics seem to be referred to by the writers of the Mishna.

[1] *Excavation of Gezer*, ii. 35

4. The commonest type of oven for baking, however, one that was in use from earliest Israelite times and continues to the present day, is the *tannûr* (Accadian *tinuru*). It consists of a large earthenware receptacle, about three feet in width and depth, cylindrical in shape, and provided at its base with an opening into which the draught can be led. It is not a portable contrivance, but fixed either on the surface of the ground or buried level with the surface (thus forming a kind of pit). A fire is lit in the interior, and when sufficient heat has been generated and the flames have fallen, the inner walls (sometimes plastered) are cleaned, and the flat pieces of dough are dexterously placed on them through the opening above and retained there by means of a cushion. Sometimes ovens of this kind, built around with bricks or stone for protection, were grouped together in the suburbs of towns, as was the case in ancient Jerusalem, where the professional bakers (cf. Jer 37^{21}) established themselves in the western outskirts, adjoining the 'tower of the furnaces' (*Migdol hattannûrim*, Neh 3^{11} 12^{38}), and as they are at the present day at *el-Qubab*, on the road from Jaffa to Jerusalem. Pictures of such *tannûrim* are found on the walls of the tomb of Rameses III at Thebes, and on an Assyrian bas-relief in Berlin Museum depicting a military camp with the army commissary preparing the bread.[2] Such representations, as well as the remains of *tannûrim* unearthed in excavations, show that these are largely similar to the ones used in Palestine at the present day.

5. A type of oven common in the country districts of Palestine to-day is the *furn*, a kind of 'two-storey' furnace, and it is not improbable that this may be the one called *kîraïm* in Leviticus (11^{35}), a dual word which is generally supposed to signify a cooking-stove for 'two pots,' but may quite likely have been a baking oven similar to the *furn*. Perhaps also the earthenware contrivance of two stories which Garstang discovered at Jericho, and which he suggests may be the model of a neolithic house or shrine, may have been of the same nature.[3]

All these various methods were suitable either for leavened bread (*ḥâmêṣ*), which was more common among the Israelites in later times than generally supposed, or for unleavened (*maṣṣôth*), which was used at ordinary meals when these had to be hastily prepared (cf. Gn 19^3), and was enjoined in the case of sacrificial and Passover feasts owing to ancient taboos adopted by the Israelite priesthood.

[2] Meissner, *Babylonien und Assyrien*, i. pl. 63.

[3] *Annals of Archaeology and Anthropology*, xxiii, pl. xl; *The Story of Jericho*, 56.

When leaven was required, this was generally secured by breaking down a piece of a previous day's 'batch,' mixing it with the new unleavened mass, and allowing it to stand 'till the whole was leavened.'

In addition to the ordinary cakes or bread, there were various kinds of 'bakemeats' (cf. Gn 40^{17}), such as 'cracknels' (1 K 14^{3}) and others, whose nature cannot be identified now. Cereals, moreover, were not always baked. The grain was sometimes merely roasted or parched, and in this form (known as *qâli* in the Old Testament, cf. 1 S 17^{17} 25^{18}, 2 S 17^{28}, Lv 23^{14}, Ru 2^{14}) was often made into a kind of 'polenta' or mixture of various ingredients. Sometimes also the grain, after being simply scalded in hot water, was mixed with butter or fat, then dried in the sun, and finally crushed in stone mortars (cf. Pr 27^{22} R.V.), of which a large number have been found in excavations. This latter kind of fare is still very common, especially among country people in Syria, who call it *burġul*. Its ancient name is unknown.

Israelite Warfare.

Among nomadic people, such as the early Semites, there could be no regular army or any organized and disciplined body of troops. In such a case the art of war generally reduced itself to incursions by one tribe on the territory of another, not as acts of aggression on their part but rather with the object of seizing the cattle and securing spoil. The number of armed men participating in these *ghezzous* or frays was never very considerable, few if any of them were killed, and established rulers hardly regarded such expeditions as dangerous or tragic. Occasionally it happened that animosity increased to such an extent between neighbouring tribes that actual war resulted. Such a conflict, however, did not last long, and as a rule took the form of a *mêlée* or hand-to-hand fight, without order or system, followed by pursuit of the enemy and pillage of his encampment and territory. In such a 'war' the troops engaged were not numerous. Gideon, we read, chose only three hundred men to fall upon the Midianites, and the tribe of Dan in its early days could boast of only six hundred men of war (Jg $18^{11.\ 16.\ 17}$).

The settled Canaanite population, who were under 'kings' or rulers and had to face the Hebrew invaders under Joshua, were fairly well armed. The whole land at the time was under Egyptian control, though it was beginning to slip away during the later years of Amenophis III (1419–1383 B.C.) when the invasion probably took place (Garstang fixes the destruction of Jericho between 1400 and 1385 B.C.). Every town had its garrison of local guards, who watched from the ramparts and were strengthened in many cases by Egyptian troops. In addition, the garrisons in the plains possessed war chariots, which gave them great superiority over the Israelite forces.

It was not till the monarchy was established that there was any regular army in Israel. Then every man between twenty and fifty years of age (Nu 1^{3}, 2 Ch 25^{5}; Josephus, *Ant.*, III. xii. 4) who was able to bear arms was liable, in theory at least, to be 'called up.' But the call never seems to have been carried out in its entirety. Under David the total effective force is given as 30,000 men, but it was only a limited number (24,000) who were provided for in his scheme of military training, and these received instruction at the rate of 2000 a month throughout the year, each monthly draft being commanded by its specially appointed officer (1 Ch 27). Certain exemptions from conscription were provided by the War Code, which, though embodied in the Deuteronomic legislation, was probably based on laws or customs dating from David's time. Those exempted included young men who happened to be betrothed (Dt 20^{7}) or newly married (Dt 24^{5}), men who had built a house or planted a vineyard but had not yet benefited by their labour (Dt $20^{5.\ 6}$), and those who were overcome by fear or faintheartedness (Dt 20^{8}). It was found inconvenient, however, as Judas Maccabæus discovered later, to fulfil these regulations literally, just as it was found impracticable to abstain from fighting on the Sabbath because the laws prescribed rest that day.

Under David, in addition to the national levy, there was a royal bodyguard (somewhat similar to the Prætorian Guard of the Roman emperors), composed of a permanent force of foreign mercenaries, the Cherethites and Pelethites, about whose identity there is no certainty. Perhaps the former were Phœnicians or Cretans in occupation of a district in the Negeb, as the Ras Shamra Tablets are believed by some to indicate, and the latter may have been Philistines recruited from the coast. David seems further to have been protected by a body of 600 Gittites from Gath and its neighbourhood (2 S 15^{18}). These groups of personal guards, when combined, must have formed a strong nucleus for a standing army.

David's military organization was probably continued under Solomon, who moreover provided the army with war chariots and a cavalry corps (1 K 4^{26} 9^{22} 10^{26}), detachments of which he stationed

in the principal garrison towns, such as Megiddo, where his royal stables have been uncovered by excavators from the Oriental Institute of Chicago. The cavalry, so-called, was never suitable, however, for charging an enemy. The horseman was without stirrups, and had not sufficient stability to enable him to rush offensively into combat. Instead, he used tactics of surprise, harassing the enemy's wings and causing disorder and stampede. The chariots, on the contrary, formed the most powerful arm in a battle. They were manned after the Hittite manner by parties of three—a driver who had to control the two horses, a warrior to do the fighting, and a shield-bearer.

The armament of the troops was far from being uniform. The tribe of Benjamin raised a body of archers and slingers, who protected themselves with bucklers. But the principal arms consisted of spears, javelins, or swords, these last having a short broad blade, sometimes curved like a scimitar (*harpé*). The fighters advanced into battle carrying large shields and wearing helmets. They were usually clothed in leather tunics covered largely with metal scales ('coats of mail,' Heb. *širyônim* or *širyônôth*, 2 Ch 26^{13} R.V., cf. 1 K 22^{34}, 1 S 17^{5}, also figuratively Is 59^{17}). Such at least was the equipment which, according to the Chronicler, King Uzziah provided for his permanent army when he led them against the Philistines, though it is improbable that all the Israelite units were as heavily armed.

The Biblical accounts give us some idea of what the favourite tactics were in Israelite combats. It seems to have been a common plan to divide the forces into three divisions (cf. Jg 7^{16}, 1 S 11^{11}, 2 S 18^{2}), and the attacks consisted largely in encircling movements (2 S 5^{23}), especially when the enemy occupied higher ground; in surprise attacks during the night (Jg 7^{19}, 1 S 11^{11}); and in ambushes, in order to fall upon the enemy in front and rear (Jos 8^{19}, Jg 20^{29}). Later strategic conceptions are referred to pretty fully by the author of the First Book of Maccabees.[1]

For the Israelites, however, and ancient peoples in general the chief affair was not so much the fighting in open country as the siege of towns. In this type of warfare the attacking party generally commenced by cutting off the water-supply, if possible. An effort was then made to capture the town by surprise attack. For this purpose spies were used as a rule to ascertain the enemy's strength (Jos 2^{1}, Jg 1^{24}), and an attempt could then be made to enter the town at some point known to be insecurely guarded. It was in this way that David succeeded in taking possession of Jerusalem, through a party of his men climbing up by the *ṣinnor* or subterranean conduit (leading from the outside spring now known as Mary's Well), and thus gaining the interior unperceived and throwing open the gates to the besiegers; and Joab seems to have had recourse to somewhat similar tactics when he laid siege to the Ammonite town of Rabbah (2 S 10–12), for he first captured the spring from which the inhabitants derived their water-supply (2 S 12^{27}, reading 'spring of waters' for 'city of waters'). Often, however, it was necessary to take stronger measures in besieging a town. Sometimes the glacis was tunnelled beneath the ramparts; or the wall was undermined at one or more spots and wooden supports or stanchions were then inserted beneath to keep the upper part in position till an opportune moment, when the wood was fired and the wall fell.[2] In later times besiegers also used battering-rams against the lower walls, or pushed forward mantlet towers from which to attack the watchers on the top. The Israelite army was provided by Uzziah with machines of war (2 Ch 26^{15}), which had been in common use in Assyria, and pictures of which are given in the reliefs of Nineveh. The fall of the walls was the signal for the sack of the town. All those who did not succumb beneath the fury of the besiegers were led into slavery or put to hard labour (2 S 12^{31} R.V.m.), unless the town had previously fallen under the *ḥerem* or ban, in which case every living being was slain and all booty was devoted to Yahweh Ṣĕbāōth ('The Lord of Hosts'), for to the Israelites war was holy, and the king prided himself on being God's champion.

The Jewish Diaspora.

The three deportations of the Jews by their Babylonian conquerors, which took place in 597, 586, and 582 B.C. (Jer 52^{28-30}), were carried out in the usual ruthless manner depicted on the monuments. The captives were gathered together in a concentration camp (for the deportation of 586, one of the places of concentration was Ramah, modern *er-Ram*, five miles north of Jerusalem, cf. Jer 40^{1} 31^{15}). Most if not all of the men were either bound separately with chains or ropes, or had the left arm of one fastened to the right arm of another. After being ranged in a long column,

[1] Cf. Abel, 'Topographie des compagnes machabéennes' in *Revue Biblique*, 1923, p. 495; 1924, pp. 201, 371; 1925, p. 194; 1926, pp. 206, 510, etc.)

[2] See the author's article in Expository Times, xliii. (1931), 91.

they were driven forward under the shouts and clubs of the officers. In the course of a few days, when they had travelled far from their homeland and all hope of escape had vanished, some of them were generally released from their bonds; but it is certain that the first part of the journey at least was made under circumstances of great suffering. The women, in general, were not bound, perhaps because they were loaded with utensils and provisions. If any one could not endure the fatigue and hardship of such a journey covering about a thousand miles and lasting several months (cf. Ezr 7^{9}), under the summer and autumn heat of the Syrian desert, he was left by the wayside till hunger did its work or the jackals ended his life; and there can be little doubt that the road from Jerusalem to Babylon was strewn with the bodies of these unfortunate captives, who included the flower of the nation, both 'elders' and maidens (cf. La 2^{10}).

On arrival in Babylon, the exiles were put to hard labour. Some were employed in huge works of reconstruction which Nebuchadrezzar was executing (cf. Berosus, *ap.* Josephus, *Ant.*, x., xi. 1); others were set to the labour of canalization, on the prosperity of which the country largely depended; and others again were placed in agricultural work, on important farms belonging either to the king himself or to large proprietors or to the Babylonian sanctuaries. All were under constant surveillance and control but enjoyed a certain amount of liberty, almost like what an early American planter allowed his negro slaves provided they wrought hard and remained loyal to him.

In the course of time, the condition of the captives improved, especially after the death of Nebuchadrezzar (562 B.C.). The work accomplished by the more intelligent and active among them drew forth the appreciation of their masters, and they were permitted to build houses and plant gardens (Jer 29^{5}), to enjoy family life (Jer 29^{6}), and to create new villages in their particular district. The names of some of these villages have come down to us: Tell-Aviv, 'Hill of the barley' (Ezk 3^{15}), probably the most important of the Jewish centres, situated near the canal Kebar;[1] Tell-Ḥarshâ, 'Hill of the plough' (Ezr 2^{59}, Neh 7^{61}); Tell-Melaḥ, 'Hill of salt' (*ibid.*); Kerub-Addan (*ibid.*); Immer (*ibid.*); and Kasiphiâ (Ezr 8^{17}).

These colonies grew more and more into centres of social life, when the captives became resigned to their position. Commercial enterprise developed, the comforts and commodities of life increased, and many Jewish families became rich. Proof of this is seen in the fact that, within a generation or two, these colonists possessed thousands of slaves (Ezr 2^{65}), and were able to give for the work of rebuilding Jerusalem no less than 61,000 darics of gold and 5000 pounds (*mineh*) of silver (Ezr 2^{69}; but cf. Neh 7^{70-72}), and probably more afterwards. Within half a century, indeed, their faithfulness and ability had given them an important position of influence in business, in State administration, and in Court life. Many of them found themselves so well off in exile that, when they had the choice of returning to Palestine, they preferred to remain, and even showed a certain amount of coldness and indifference towards their own nation.

Evidence of the progressiveness and material welfare of these people, sons and grandsons of those carried into captivity, is to be found in the records of an important Jewish Banking Company ('Murashu and Sons') discovered at *Nuffar* (ancient Nippur) in Babylonia. These records, consisting of about seven hundred tablets, which date from the reign of Artaxerxes I (464–424 B.C.) and Darius II (423–405 B.C.), include commercial contracts with a large number of Jewish clients, descendants of the exiles, and throw considerable light on the Jewish population that remained in Babylon. Many of the names mentioned are clearly Hebrew: Natûnu, Shabbatâ, Ḥaggai, Ḥanani, etc., and many are compounded with Jahweh (or Yâma), such as Gadalyâma, Yadiḥyâma, Aḥiyâma, Yaḥulûnu (for Yaḥulanu, 'Yahweh is with us'), Dâdiya, etc. There were probably many other prosperous commercial companies in existence among the exiles, the records of which have not come down to us.

[1] This is not the river Khabur (Chaboras) of north-west Mesopotamia, but the *Nâr Kabarî*, 'great canal,' which watered the city of Nippur to the south-east of Babylon. It was here that the prophet Ezekiel and others were placed (Ezk 1^{1-3}).

Contributions and Comments.

Romans iii. 3.

SANDAY and Headlam take the words ἠπίστησαν and ἀπιστία as referring to 'unbelief' rather than to 'unfaithfulness,' although they are careful to add that 'the one sense rather suggests than excludes the other.' The natural contrast to the 'faithfulness' of God (the only meaning which πίστις can have here) is the 'unfaithfulness' of Israel. The question is whether Paul would be content with a verbal and imperfect contrast. Such a possibility, it seems, cannot be denied.

There are two points, however, which seem to favour a reference to 'unfaithfulness.' One is the use of ἀπιστέω in contrast to πιστός in 2 Ti 2^{13}, with the meaning of 'be unfaithful.' ('Faithless' is the word used in the English translations, and it can mean 'unfaithful' or 'unbelieving.' But the former meaning is generally favoured here.) A second point arises from the context. 'Let God be ἀληθής,' says the next verse, 'and every man ψεύστης.' The contrast of 'true' and 'lying' in respect to a pledge or promise surely confirms a previous antithesis of 'faithfulness' and 'unfaithfulness.'

It seems that no English translation has rendered the words unambiguously in this way, but I note that Professor Dodd does so in his *Moffatt Comm.*, p. 44, deviating for a moment from Moffatt's version. Moffatt uses the equivocal word 'faithlessness,' but suggests the present interpretation in the use of the word 'untrustworthy' to translate ἠπίστησαν.

J. GWYN GRIFFITHS.

The Queen's College, Oxford.

Entre Nous.

The Christian Movement in China.

The Bishop of Bristol said a short time ago, 'It would be refreshing if some one would take in hand the task of describing—very apologetically of course—some of the things which the Church has done and is still trying to do for the material and spiritual welfare of the community.' To some extent this is what Professor Bates of Nanking University has done for the Christian Movement in China in an important article which he has contributed to *The International Review of Missions* for the current quarter. We can only give a few short quotations from this, and deal with the lighter side of the article, but would direct the attention of all readers to it.

Professor Bates gives a telling quotation from the *China Critic*, an organ of intellectuals which was often severely hostile to missions in the past. 'One of the many things that have come out of the present war has been the realization that, whatever doubts may have existed in the past, the Christian missions in China fully and indispensably justify their existence. . . . How without a moment's hesitation they faced the test and were not found wanting will remain one of the most dramatic and epoch-making pages in the history of Christian missions throughout the world. To-day, after two years of hostilities, the Christian missions in China have built themselves a record of which they may be justly proud. They have preached the gospel not with words but by a practical demonstration of the love of God and the brotherhood of man. They have definitely found their place in the life of the nation, fulfilling great human needs in its hour of travail.'

An interesting development in the Chinese attitude towards Christianity is the tolerance—even the appreciation—among members of the communists. 'The Eighth Route Army has semi-officially published its thanks for the "kindness and help" rendered to China by foreign missionaries, especially by doctors and nurses. . . . Somewhat terrifying was the communist acceptance of a Christian preacher who had joined a communist group in the north-west. When he told them he could do nothing but preach, they replied: "Here we are all equal. You may preach, but you must preach eight hours a day."'

As Dr. Mott declared early in the war period, China is 'the greatest area and volume of relatively unrelieved suffering of modern times.' 'There are tens of millions of children,' Professor Bates says, 'reaching school age who have no conception of peace or security. As a child saw pictures of Jesus thronged by the crowd, he asked anxiously, "Where will they hide when the aeroplanes come?" No explanations could enable him to imagine a time and a place without bombing raids.'

In spite of the terrible years of war through which they are passing the Chinese Christians are still full of sympathy for Japanese soldiers. 'In the course of a prayer service, a Chinese bishop said to his congregation: Brethren, I exhort you to bethink yourselves of the boys of Japan, sent against their will by a ruthless military spirit to do things in a foreign land against which their souls revolt. I exhort you to bethink yourselves at this time of the thousands of those poor boys who even now are lying in torture and maimed, and whose life's blood is now being drunk by a foreign soil.' Those in the Christian Movement are amazingly free of hatred.

Chinese Christian thought has broadened during the war years, and concern for their neighbours has greatly increased. Christian hospitals now endlessly serve refugees and destitute persons amid great decline of other medical aid. 'As the able son of a leading Muslim declared, after serving long with a Christian relief group, "Only the Christians had the spirit and the energetic co-operation to do something worth while." The words of Archbishop Zanin's Circular Letter (31st October 1937) are impressively true: 'The soldiers of Christ, indeed a well-organized brotherly army, are bringing help to all whom the war has dispossessed; . . . the armaments of love are arrayed against the armaments of death.'

Dr. Martin Niemoeller.

The *National Jewish Monthly* has just published news of Dr. Martin Niemoeller, and this is handed on in the November-December number of *World Dominion*. This news has come from a Jew, by name Leo Stein, who was with Niemoeller first of all at the Moabit prison and latterly in the Concentration Camp of Sachsenhausen. Stein was apparently freed from the Concentration Camp and has now arrived in America. He saw Niemoeller just before he left. Among the incidents which he gives is the following one.

'One day, in the presence of Niemoeller, a guard shot a poor Jew who had fallen exhausted, through excess of work. "I saw Niemoeller shake with indignation," writes Stein. "While the tears ran down his face, he exclaimed, loud enough for the Nazis to hear him: 'Forgive them, Lord, for they know not what they do.' One of the guards who heard him then approached, and looking upon him with contempt, shoved him about as he shouted: 'To the barracks with you!'"

'A few days after, in the Concentration Camp, the same guard, roughly striking Niemoeller, insolently shouted at him; "Where is your poor God now? Why does He not come to your help?" He then commanded him to salute, and say: "Heil Hitler!" Niemoeller, however, remained indifferent. The guard then slapped him again, roaring like a wild beast: "Salute, Heil Hitler!"

'Niemoeller still kept silent. Just at that moment, another prisoner—a Jew—stepped out of the ranks, and the guard rushed towards him and thrashed him till he left him stretched out on the ground. All the prisoners realized that the Jew had done this with the sole object of distracting the attention of the brutal guard and thus drawing him away from Niemoeller for a moment.'

For Fellowship's Sake.

Sir Hugh Walpole's latest book is an addition not to his historical novels but to those that deal with contemporary events, and the scene is that part of Cornwall—Polchester—which he has made so familiar to his readers. The story opens with the coming to Garth House of Julius Cromwell (blinded in the last war) and his young wife Celia. The title of the book is *The Blind Man's House—A Quiet Story*. When Celia saw the house she exclaimed, 'Oh, Julius, we're going to be happy here! I know we are. It's a lovely house! I'll do everything—everything!' But there was nothing for her to do and therein lay much of the trouble. The house of Garth was well run by an old family housekeeper. For other things Julius depended on his valet, and on his chauffeur, who had also been with him for years. More than this, Julius' very blindness proved a barrier. For he withdrew himself into a secret world of dreams and mysteries which separated him from the wife he loved, and who perhaps loved him too possessively. 'My blindness does not want to be cosseted and protected and comforted and cared for. It is proud and independent,' he confides to his Diary. So Celia is thrown into close companionship with Jim Burke, an engaging young man, employed by her husband. A combination of circumstances rouses distrust of the world he cannot see, nor can Julius see the face which would have given him, whatever happened, full assurance of her love and integrity. So he fell into 'filthy depths of jealousy.' 'As I write now, I am altogether miserable. . . . Last evening was the worst of my life. . . . I saw the world torn by a fearful devastating war, and this time the evil powers everywhere triumphed, as I think they may do, for, during these twenty years, we have been slack, unimaginative, slothful, careless.'

The finest thing in *The Blind Man's House* is the

development of the mental and spiritual life of Julius Cromwell. Towards the end we find him writing, 'I love Celia—oh, how I love her! And yet a short time ago, in that rubbish-heap past, I was hidden from her by the ignominy of that battle between the jealous animal in me and the seeing spirit. Had I lost her—as I so nearly did—how many others, how much good life, would have been lost with her!'

Those who care for delineation of character rather than for plot will find real satisfaction in this chronicle of the people of the house and village of Garth—its rector, Mr. Brennan, and his wife and family, Mr. Lamplough, husband of 'the worst gossip in England,' a bitter old man but one who loved Julius.

Mrs. Mark, a delightful, middle-aged widow says, to the vicar's daughter in answer to her question, 'what makes the real difference between people?' 'I think the great difference is whether people are generous-hearted or not. I don't mean whether people just give money away or not, but whether their hearts are generous or mean. Whether they'll take risks and be generous in ideas, in love, in trust, in optimism, in not wanting to own the people they love, in defending their friends if they're attacked—ready to lose their souls, you know, unselfishly, and so gain them. . . . It's the generous-hearted who see God—now, just as it was thousands of years ago.' She laughed. 'There, my dear, I've been preaching a sermon, but you asked me, you know.' This is the truth that Julius Cromwell also learns so that he is able to say, 'But at least I have learned this lesson of our interdependence—the lesson that all mankind now must learn, the twin lessons of interdependence and charity. No one of us can move any more—can sigh or sneeze, cough or whisper—without disturbing the rest of us.

'The Brennans, the old maids, Lizzie's dreadful Douglas, old Lamplough, my friend Mrs. Mark, Celia and I—unless we have fellowship together we have nothing. It seems to me that until we learn this fellowship—the fellowship, generous and understanding—of all living men on this earth, made so essential now by our close quarters, the impossibility of our escape from one another, there will be no peace. . . .

'And so I got Celia, as the final word in this house for a month or two, to get out my beloved-from-a-boy—Morris's *Dream of John Ball*, and I have written down on the opposite page of this Journal these famous words that I have so long known by heart. And when I lay the pen down Celia kneels by me and reads them.

'Forsooth, brothers, fellowship is heaven, and lack of fellowship is hell; fellowship is life, and lack of fellowship is death; and the deeds that ye do upon the earth, it is for fellowship's sake that ye do them, and the life that is in it, that shall live on and on for ever, and each one of you part of it, while many a man's life upon the earth from the earth shall wane. Therefore, I bid you not dwell in hell but in heaven, or while ye must, upon earth, which is a part of heaven, and forsooth no foul part.'

And so with what regret we take leave of Hugh Walpole in this his last book.

Signed Up.

'We keep on hoping until we ourselves are ended. In that hour I faced it. I probably would not die of leprosy, but I would die a leper. What was there left in life for me?

'Across the bay I could see the shadow of one of our fishing boats. More rode at anchor. Below me were the piers, the plant—a small business to American eyes, a great one in Culion. I had the respect of my fellows. I helped them to live better material lives.

'Get back to life! You cannot lie down—not just yet. Sign up for duration—sign up with your eyes open. Sign up for what you, a leper, may be able to do! Sign before your hands have gone! I took up my fountain pen and signed in indelible ink across the top of the wooden table. There was nothing above the signature. But I knew. I had abandoned personal hope. I had work, I had power—I would live and work on.

'Then I leaned back, well content. At last I desired to live. I had won my freedom. "He that loseth his life shall find it"—there was a law of compensation and Jesus of Nazareth knew it too.

'Tomas came in very late.

'"You did not come to celebrate the victory, sir?"

'"Not a complete victory, Tomas. An armistice, a truce."

'"But that means no more fighting, sir."

'"No more fighting, Tomas. No more running away. Getting on with the business of living—that is our armistice, Tomas. See"—I pointed to the signature indelibly fixed in the table top—"I signed up."'[1]

[1] Perry Burgess, *Who Walk Alone*, 196.

Printed by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.